

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## The Education, Training and Supply of Teachers in England and Wales, 1963-73: an analysis of policy formation.

### Thesis

#### How to cite:

Matthews, Peter (1989). The Education, Training and Supply of Teachers in England and Wales, 1963-73: an analysis of policy formation. MPhil thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1989 The Author



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000fc52>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

UNRESTRICTED

The Education, Training and Supply of Teachers in England and  
Wales, 1963-73: an analysis of policy formation.

Peter Matthews, MA, MEd.

A thesis presented for the degree of Master of Philosophy of  
the Open University, 1989.

Date of submission: 9<sup>th</sup> February 1989  
Date of award: 12<sup>th</sup> April 1989

ProQuest Number: 27758404

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 27758404

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
GLOSSARY of abbreviations	iii
1. INTRODUCTION - Scope and Content of the Thesis	1
2. POLICY FORMATION - Models and Approaches	19
3. POLICY FORMATION IN EDUCATION	34
4. THE ROBBINS COMMITTEE REPORT: a policy for the expansion of teacher education and training.	70
5. THE BINARY POLICY: a policy for the separate development of teacher education and training.	108
6. THE JAMES COMMITTEE REPORT: a policy for the improvement of teacher education and training.	152
7. THE 1972 WHITE PAPER, 'EDUCATION - A FRAMEWORK FOR EXPANSION:' a policy for the contraction of teacher education and training.	229
8. EDUCATIONAL POLICY FORMATION: development, continuity and change.	266
TABLES	294
BIBLIOGRAPHY	298



i

The Education, Training and Supply of Teachers in England and Wales, 1963-73: an analysis of policy formation.

#### THESIS ABSTRACT

This thesis is an historical study of the process of policy formation for the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales during the period 1963 to 1973. The thesis takes as its starting point the events leading up to the publication, in October 1963, of the Report of the Robbins Committee on 'Higher Education', and ends with the policy which emerged as a result of the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', published by the Department of Education and Science, in December 1972.

In the decade following the publication of the Robbins Report the number of students entering the Colleges and Departments of Education, and consequently the number of teachers entering the schools, rose from 54,000 to 114,000. Ten years later, however, in December 1972, a change in government policy, outlined in the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', effectively brought this expansion to an end. Under the terms of this White Paper, the 114,000 student teacher places were to be reduced to between 60,000 and 70,000.

During the same decade the expansion in the quantitative supply of teachers was matched by a qualitative change in their education and training, with the introduction of the 'Bachelor of Education' Degree. Despite this, however, and in spite of an

earlier decision to increase the normal college course from two to three years, there arose towards the end of the decade growing concern about the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training - a concern which led eventually to the setting up of the James Committee.

In January 1972, the Report of the James Committee, 'Teacher Education and Training', was completed. It was immediately published as a Green Paper by the Government and, within twelve months, in December 1972, the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for Expansion', was published by the Department of Education and Science, outlining the Government's policy for the education, training and supply of teachers for the next ten years, and incorporating in it many of the recommendations of the James Report.

This thesis aims to analyse the reasons behind these policies for the education, training and supply of teachers - their development, continuity and change - between 1963 and 1973, and in so doing to examine the two dimensions to the study of policy formation, namely 'power' and 'rationality'.

## GLOSSARY of Abbreviations

ACSTT	Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers
AAM	Association of Assistant Mistresses
ACFHE	Association of Colleges of Further and Higher Education
AEC	Association of Education Committees
AHM	Association of Head Mistresses
AMA	Assistant Masters Association
AMC	Association of Municipal Corporations
APTI	Association of Principals of Technical Institutions
ATCDE	Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education
ATTI	Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions
AUT	Association of University Teachers
BEd	Bachelor of Education Degree
CEA	Campaign for Educational Advance
CAC	Central Advisory Council for Education
CHE	Committee on Higher Education
CDP	Committee of Directors of Polytechnics
CPRS	Central Policy Review Staff
CVCP	Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals of University Institutions
CNAA	Council for National Academic Awards
CCA	County Councils Association
DES	Department of Education and Science
DipHE	Diploma in Higher Education
HMA	Head Masters Association
HMC	Head Masters Conference
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate

ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
LCC	London County Council
NACEIC	National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce
NACTST	National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers
NAHT	National Association of Head Teachers
NAS	National Association of Schoolmasters
NCTET	National Council for Teacher Education and Training
NFER	National Foundation for Educational Research
NOP	National Opinion Polls
NUS	National Union of Students
NUT	National Union of Teachers
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAR	Programme Analysis and Review
PESC	Public Expenditure Survey Committee
RCCDE	Regional Council for Colleges and Departments of Education
SCHDEP	Standing Conference of Heads of Departments of Education in Polytechnics
SEO	Society of Education Officers
UCET	Universities Council for the Education of Teachers
UGC	University Grants Committee
ULIE	University of London Institute of Education
ULIESA	University of London Institute of Education Students Association

Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION: Scope and Content of the Thesis.

"Education history is not only about the interplay of interest groups, or about the way educational systems display a tension between continuity and change. It is also about the story of struggles for influence within a Department, of the ability of individual Ministers to impress their colleagues in Cabinet, of the readiness, or otherwise, of experienced Advisers to show themselves adaptable in the light of altered circumstances." (Boyle, 1979:17).

This thesis is an historical study of the process of policy formation - the formation of policy for the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales during the period 1963-73. The thesis takes as its starting point the events leading up to the publication of the Robbins Report on 'Higher Education' in October 1963, (Robbins Report, 1963), and ends with the policy which emerged as a result of the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' - published in December 1972. (DES, 1972, White Paper).

In the decade following the publication of the Robbins Report the number of students entering the Colleges and Departments of Education, and consequently the number of teachers entering the schools, rose from 54,000 to 114,000. (Table 2). Ten years later, however, in December 1972, a change in Government policy - outlined in the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' - effectively brought this expansion to an end. Under the terms of this White Paper, the 114,000 student teacher places were reduced to between 60,000 and 70,000.

During the same decade the expansion in the quantitative supply of teachers was matched by a qualitative change in their education and training, with the introduction of the Bachelor of Education (BEd) degree. (Table 4). Despite this, however, and in spite of an earlier decision to increase the normal college course from two to three years, there arose towards the end of the decade a growing concern about the content and control of teacher education and training - a concern which led eventually to the setting up of the James Committee.

In January 1972 the James Report - 'Teacher Education and Training' - was completed. (James Report, 1972). It was immediately published as a Green Paper by the Government, and within twelve months, in December 1972, the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' was published, outlining the Government's policy for the education, training and supply of teachers for the next ten years, and incorporating in it many of the suggestions and recommendations of the James Report. (DES, 1972, White Paper).

The aims of this thesis are to examine:

- a) what policies for the education, training and supply of teachers were put forward between 1963 and 1973;
- b) by whom these policies were formulated - Parliament, Government, Department of Education and Science, Committees and Pressure Groups;
- c) how these policies came to be formulated; and
- d) why these policies were adopted or rejected.

This thesis also aims to analyse the reasons behind these policies - their DEVELOPMENT, CONTINUITY and CHANGE - and in so doing to examine the two dimensions to the study of policy formation, namely POWER and RATIONALITY. The first 'power' - including authority, control, influence - is concerned with politics, involving conflict, ideology and analysing how social groups and organisations bring influence to bear on those entitled to take and enforce legally binding decisions. The second 'rationality' is concerned with administration - involving analysis, organisation and planning - "an activity that concerns itself with proposals for the future, and with the evaluation of alternative proposals, and with the methods by which these proposals may be achieved." (Smith, 1976:24).

In particular, this thesis aims to test the following hypotheses for the period under consideration, 1963-73:

a) that in policy formation in general, and in policy formation in education, in particular, the rational dimension to the process of policy formation gradually became stronger and more noticeable in the field of government;

b) that such techniques as policy review, cost benefit analysis and output budgeting, while leading to an improvement in the capacity of Government for rational decision-making, also led to an increase in the power and control of Government, as represented by the DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, with its ultimate control over the two key areas of 'resources' and 'information';

c) that increased rationalisation and centralisation led to a decrease in the influence of the various INTEREST and PRESSURE GROUPS in the field of education, as represented by the Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations; and

d) that the debates, discussions and controversies about the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education, training and supply between 1963 and 1973 became dominated by Government economic policy and the search for economic efficiency, and by the question of resources, numbers and costs in higher education as a whole.



## SOURCES OF EVIDENCE &amp; SURVEY OF LITERATURE.

As stated at the beginning of this introductory chapter, this thesis is concerned with policy formation, in particular with policy formation for the education, training and supply of teachers between 1963 and 1973 - what the policies were, by whom they were put forward, and how, and why, they were accepted, or rejected. In examining the sources of evidence and surveying the literature on policies for the education, training and supply of teachers the main problem is not in discovering what the policies were - these can usually be identified from official printed sources; nor in discovering the actions and reactions of the main protagonists and pressure groups - such actions and reactions can usually be discovered from their own official comments and pronouncements, and from accounts in the educational press: rather the problem is in discovering the relationships - 'the networks of interaction' - between the main protagonists, between the authorities and partisans; in seeing who impacted on whom, and with what effect, and in identifying those who made the decisions, in short, "the process of policy formation." (Kogan, 1975:21).

A second problem is that, in order to understand the how and why of policy formation one needs access to the sources of information and statistics upon which the policies were made.

Unfortunately, the information and statistics are not always readily accessible. Indeed, it is a perennial problem about policies for the education, training and, in particular, the supply of teachers during the period under consideration that such information and statistics had, it was claimed, to be confidential, either because of the Official Secrets Act, or the nature of advice to Ministers from Civil Servants, or the collective responsibility of Ministers. As the Department of Education and Science put it, in an official reply to a House of Commons Select Committee on the provision of information to Government Departments, "The Government, like their predecessors, attach major importance to preserving two essential features of our system of government. The first is that the advice given by Officials to Ministers should remain confidential. In the Government's view the retention of this confidential basis of official advice is to be of maximum benefit to Ministers in reaching their decisions. The second principle is that the process of consultation between Ministers and between Departments on their behalf, and the level and manner in which decisions are taken, must also remain confidential. In reaching decisions Ministers collectively frequently have to take into account conflicting departmental points of view. Once such decisions have been taken, however, it becomes the collective responsibility of the Government to abide by them." (DES, 1980:3).

This lack of information and statistics is a particular problem with regard to the James Report on 'Teacher Education and Training', (James Report 1972); and the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion.' (DES, 1972 White Paper). As Warren points out, "The James Report studiously avoids all but passing reference to the evidence which it had at its disposal. Without access to this evidence our debates can circle and founder. We shall never be able to read any transcripts of those informal discussions which the James Committee had with the various representatives." (Warren, 1973:37).

One of the main criticisms made of the James Committee is that it merely issued a Report - it did not publish in a comprehensive and referenced form any of the evidence submitted to it. The Report merely contains a series of Appendices listing the sources of written and oral evidence submitted to the James Committee: it does not contain any of the evidence. The James Report is particularly silent on the problem of teacher supply. Indeed, there is no real discussion on the problem of teacher supply - apart from one sentence: "To put it bluntly, the 'supply' of new teachers is now increasing so rapidly that it must soon catch up with any likely assessment of future demand, and choices will have to be made very soon

between various ways of using, or diverting, some of the resources at present invested in the education and training of teachers". (James Report, 1972:75).

Similarly, the 1972 White Paper - 'Education: a framework for expansion' - would have more value if it revealed the calculations and costings upon which the policy it proposed was based, if it explained the implications of this policy with greater candour, and spelled out the mechanisms by which it would be achieved. The Government persistently refused, as this thesis will examine, to reveal the basis of its policy decisions with regard to the supply of teachers.

The sources of evidence used, therefore, in this thesis are, as PRIMARY SOURCES, officially published records and reports, together with published testimony and evidence, where available; the published accounts of the main protagonists in the policy formation process, supplemented, where possible, by questions and interviews; and as SECONDARY SOURCES, all manner of accounts, comments and assessments by a wide range of observers, educationists, academics and writers, a great deal of which has to be sifted of bias, partisanship and distortion.

The 'primary sources' consulted and analysed in this thesis may be divided into two kinds of 'official' publication -

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS and COMMAND PAPERS. 'Parliamentary Papers' include Hansard accounts of debates, questions and proceedings in Parliament, and the reports and evidence contained in the proceedings of parliamentary Select Committees. In the latter case, the proceedings of the Select Committee on Education and Science, and the Select Committee on Expenditure are particularly important since they provide invaluable evidence and insight into the making of policy in education prior to the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'. The Select Committee on Education and Science, for example, collected evidence, examined witnesses and issued reports on various aspects of education, including teacher training in the 1966-1970 Parliament. (Select Committee, 1968, 1969 & 1970). The Select Committee on Expenditure, first established in 1971, reported on various aspects of education in general, but in 1976 issued an extremely important report on 'policy making in the Department of Education and Science'. (Select Committee, 1971, 1972 & 1976). The latter report was prompted by a critical report from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development which examined the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' as a piece of policy making by Government. (OECD, 1975).

'Command Papers' include Government and Department of Education and Science White Papers, Reports, Circulars and Memoranda, and

the Reports of various Advisory Committees, such as the National Advisory Committee on the Training and Supply of Teachers (NACTST, 1951-1965), the University Grants Committee (UGC, 1968 & 1974), and Committees of Inquiry, such as the Robbins and James Committees. (Robbins Report, 1963 & James Report, 1972).

In addition, there have been consulted and analysed the published minutes, accounts and comments of the various LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY ASSOCIATIONS - the Association of Municipal Corporations, the County Councils Association and the Association of Education Committees; and the TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS - Assistant Masters Association, Association of Assistant Mistresses, National Association of Head Teachers, National Association of Schoolmasters, National Union of Teachers; Association of University Teachers, Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, and the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, together with the published evidence of these Associations to the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science and the James Committee.

Finally, among the primary sources of evidence, are the accounts of the main protagonists in the policy formation process during the period in question - politicians, officials

and advisers, including Secretaries and Ministers of State for Education, Permanent (Under) Secretaries and Deputy (Under) Secretaries, and other high ranking officials at the Department of Education and Science, and the members of Advisory Committees and Committees of Inquiry. These accounts have been recorded either in autobiographies, or autobiographical accounts, or in interviews and discussions with educational writers and journalists.

In particular, this thesis has made use of the statements on educational policy formation made by Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland, former Ministers of Education, to Maurice Kogan, (Kogan, 1971), and by former Ministers of State, Edward Boyle, Gerald Fowler and Lord Crowther Hunt. (Boyle, 1966, 1972 & 1979; Fowler, 1972, 1973, 1974 & 1979, and Hencke, 1977 & 1978). Equally important are the accounts by former high ranking Civil Servants at the Department of Education and Science, notably the former Permanent (Under) Secretary, Sir William Pile (Pile, 1974 & 1979), and Sir Toby Weaver, former Permanent Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, responsible for teacher education, training and supply between 1962 and 1972. (Weaver, 1973 & 1979). Hugh Harding, former Permanent (Under) Secretary provides valuable comment on the problem of teacher supply before and after the James Report in 1972. (Harding, 1978).

Among the SECONDARY SOURCES of evidence consulted and analysed the most important are the books, articles and papers dealing with 'policy formation' in general and 'policy formation in education' in particular. A full discussion of the former will be found in Chapter 2 of this thesis, and of the latter in Chapter 3. Suffice to say for the moment, that the works of Downs, Simon and Lindblom have contributed enormously to the study of policy formation in general, (Downs, 1957 & 1967; Simon, 1965; and Lindblom, 1959, 1965 & 1968); while the works of Chapman, Coates, Finer, Kogan, Manzer and Rose, have made a great contribution to the study of policy formation in education in particular. (Chapman, 1973; Coates, 1972; Finer, 1966; Kogan, 1971, 1973 & 1975; Manzer, 1970; and Rose, 1969, 1980 & 1981).

This thesis has made use of the studies by Armitage, Hencke, Kogan and Lukes on the role of the Department of Education and Science in the formation of educational policy, (Armitage, 1973; Hencke, 1977 & 1978; Kogan, 1971 & 1973; and Lukes, 1967 & 1975), and by Coates, Kogan and Manzer on the activities of interest groups and pressure groups. (Coates, 1972; Kogan, 1971 & 1975 and Manzer, 1970). In the study of teacher supply, particular mention must be made of Ahamad, Armitage, Blaug, Drake, Westoby and Williams. (Ahamad, 1970; Ahamad and Blaug, 1973; Armitage, 1973; Drake, 1973 & 1974; Westoby, 1979 and



Williams, 1972 & 1973).

A full list of the primary and secondary sources consulted in this thesis will be found in the Bibliography.

## Chapter 1. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES.

## REFERENCES

- Ahamad, W (1970), 'A Post Mortem on Teacher Supply Forecasts'. Higher Education Review, 2. 3, pp.21-40.
- Ahamad, W and Blaug, M (1973), The Practice of Manpower Forecasting. Elsevier.
- Armitage, P (1973), 'Planning in Practice: the work and legacy of the external committee', in: Fowler, G (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.
- Armitage, P (1973), 'The White Paper: a step into the dark'. Higher Education Review, 5. 2, pp.3-25.
- Boyle, E (1966), 'Parliament and University Policy'. Minerva, 5. 1, pp.3-19.
- Boyle, E (1972), 'Ministers and Educational Reports'. Universities Quarterly, 27. 1, pp.3-10.
- Boyle, E (1979), Government, Parliament and the Robbins Report. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).
- Chapman, R A (1973), The Role of Commissions in Policy Making. Allen & Unwin.
- Coates, R D (1972), Teachers' Unions and Interest Group Politics. Cambridge University Press.
- DES (1972), Teacher Education and Training: a report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. (James Report). HMSO.
- DES (1972), Education: a framework for expansion. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 5174).
- DES (1980), The Provision of Information by Government Departments to Select Committees. HMSO.
- Downs, A (1957), An Economic Theory of Democracy. Harper.
- Downs, A (1967), Inside Bureaucracy. Little Brown.
- Drake, K (1973), 'The Scope for Economic Analysis', in: Lomax, D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.
- Drake, K (1974), 'Never Mind the Quality, Sir - Feel the Thrift'. Education for Teaching, 94, pp.4-10.
- Finer, S E (1966), Anonymous Empire: a study of the lobby in Great Britain. Pall Mall.

Fowler, G T (1972), 'The Binary Policy in England and Wales', in: World Year Book of Education, 1972-73. Evans.

Fowler, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

Fowler, G T (1974), Central Government in Education. Open University. (Decision Making in British Education Systems).

Fowler, G. T (1979), 'The Accountability of Ministers', in: Lello, J (1979), Accountability in Education. Ward Lock.

Harding, H A (1978), 'Harding Replies to Hencke over College Closures'. Education, 29 December 1978 & 5 January 1979.

Hencke, D (1977), 'The Government and College Reorganisation'. Higher Education Review, 9. 3, pp.7-18.

Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.

Higher Education Committee (1963), Higher Education: a report of the Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins. (Robbins Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2154).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1968), Her Majesty's Inspectorate. HMSO. (HC 400).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1969), Student Relationships. HMSO. (HC 449).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), Teacher Training. HMSO. (HC 182).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1971), Governmental Financial Control and Budgeting in Education. (Second Report). HMSO. (HC 545).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1972), Further and Higher Education. HMSO. (HC 48-1).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1976), Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science. (Tenth Report). HMSO. (HC 621).

Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kogan, M (1971), The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan. Penguin.

Kogan, M (1973), 'The Function of the Central Advisory Council in Educational Change', in: Fowler, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

- Kogan, M (1973), 'The Plowden Committee on Primary Education', in: Chapman, R A (1973), *The Role of Commissions in Policy Making*. Allen & Unwin.
- Kogan, M (1975), *Educational Policy Making: a study of interest groups and Parliament*. Allen & Unwin.
- Lello, J (1979), *Accountability in Education*. Ward Lock.
- Lindblom, C E (1959), 'The Science of Muddling Through'. *Public Administration Review*, 19, pp.50-59.
- Lindblom, C E (1965), *The Intelligence of Democracy*. Free Press.
- Lindblom, C E (1968), *The Policy making Process*. Prentice Hall.
- Lomax, D E (1973), *The Education of Teachers in Britain*. Wiley.
- Lukes, J R (1967), 'The Binary Policy: a critical study'. *Universities Quarterly*, 22. 1, pp.6-46.
- Lukes, J R (1975), 'Power and Policy at the Department of Education and Science: a case study'. *Universities Quarterly*, 29. 2, pp133-165.
- Manzer, R A (1970), *Teachers and Politics*. Manchester University Press.
- Morris, N, Ryba, R and Drake, K (1973), *How many Teachers? A report prepared for the National Union of Teachers*. NUT.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1975), *Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales*. OECD. (Reviews of National Policies for Education).
- Pile, W (1974), 'Corporate Planning for Education in the Department of Education and Science'. *Public Administration*, 52. 1, pp.13-22.
- Pile, W (1979), *The Department of Education and Science*. Allen & Unwin.
- NACTST (1951), *Training and Supply of Teachers*. (First Report). HMSO.
- NACTST (1951), *Recruitment and Training of Youth Leaders and Community Centre Wardens*. (Second Report). HMSO.
- NACTST (1953), *Graduate Teachers of Mathematics and Science*. (Third Report). HMSO.
- NACTST (1954), *Training and Supply of Teachers of Handicapped Pupils*. (Fourth Report). HMSO.
- NACTST (1956), *Three Year Training for Teachers*. (Fifth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1957), Scope and Content of the Three Year Course of Teacher Training. (Sixth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1962), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1960-80. (Seventh Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1962), The Future Pattern of the Education and Training of Teachers. (Eighth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1965), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1963-1986. (Ninth Report). HMSO.

Rose, R (1969), Policy Making in Britain: a reader in government. MacMillan.

Rose, R (1980), Changes in Public Employment: a multi-dimensional comparative analysis. Centre for the Study of Public Policy. (Studies in Public Policy, 61).

Rose, R (1981), The Growth of Government in the United Kingdom since 1945: a programme of research. Centre for the Study of Public Policy. (Studies in Public Policy, 94).

Simon, H A (1965), Administrative Behaviour: a study of decision making processes. MacMillan.

Smith, B (1976), Policy Making in British Government. Robertson.

University Grants Committee (1968), University Development, 1962-67. HMSO. (Cmd. 3820).

University Grants Committee (1974), University Development, 1967-72. HMSO. (Cmd. 5728)

Warren, C F (1973), 'The Evidence for James'. Education for Teaching, 90, pp.37-45.

Weaver, T (1973), Higher Education and the Polytechnics. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture, 1973-74).

Weaver, T (1979), Department of Education and Science: central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Westoby, A (1979), Finance for Education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 7).

Williams, G (1972), 'The Costs of the James Report'. Times Higher Education Supplement, 24 March 1972.

Williams, G (1972), 'Must We Choose between Nursery and University?' Times Higher Education Supplement, 29 December 1972.

Williams, G (1973), 'The End of the Robbins Era', in: Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

## Chapter 2. POLICY FORMATION - MODELS AND APPROACHES.

### SITUATIONS ISSUES AND RESPONSES.

Policy has been defined as 'a course of action adopted or pursued' or 'any course of action adopted as advantageous or expedient.' When a political party or political pressure group is said to have formed a policy to deal with a particular ISSUE, it means that the political party or pressure group has formulated and put forward a prescriptive statement of intent. Here an 'issue' is defined as a SITUATION in which, by common consent, some intervention or action is needed. (Solesbury, 1975:381).

There is at any point in time a 'public agenda' of issues to which political debate is addressing itself, a list of the most important matters to which attention is being given, and on which action is called for. Over time the political agenda changes as issues are dealt with, or no further action is required, and new issues arise to take their place on the agenda for consideration. As Cobb and Elder put it, "The political agenda contains all issues that are commonly perceived by members of the political community as meriting public attention and involving matters within the legitimate jurisdiction of existing governmental authority." (Cobb and Elder, 1972:11). Such issues call for a RESPONSE from Government. A 'response' is what the Government decides to do, or is urged to do. The principal response is a policy, and the decisions flowing from that policy which are designed to change

the situation giving rise to the issue.

Policy formation begins when differences of opinion about what should be done in a particular situation are consciously articulated in the form of political demands.(1) Such demands are directed towards the AUTHORITIES in the political system - "those individuals and bodies responsible for making the day to day decisions required of the political system, whose 'authority' rests on the fact that most people accept their decisions as binding." (Hall, 1975:25). Such authorities are being pressed, encouraged or persuaded to respond, i.e. to make certain kinds of decisions and take certain actions, often in the form of an allocation of resources in favour of those making the demands.

Demands, however, present authorities with a dilemma. They must respond to a sufficient number of demands, otherwise they may lose support in the community, since authorities come under pressure if large or significant groups lose faith in their policies, in general, or refuse to accept one policy, in particular. On the other hand, not only is support in short supply, but also the other resources, human and material, needed by authorities - finance, buildings, manpower. This imposes the need on authorities to respond selectively to demands, even on occasions by making a nil response or, at best, a partial or incomplete response.

In the British political system most major policy decisions, and the associated allocation of resources, are the ultimate



responsibility of the Government, headed by the Prime Minister, advised by a Cabinet of senior colleagues. The latter are normally Ministers in charge of a particular Department of State, and are conventionally responsible to Parliament for the conduct and management of the affairs of their Departments and its Civil Servants.(2) It would be a mistake, however, to consider authorities purely as decision-makers with respect to policy: for in dealing with policy issues they act in other ways as well. For example, they add support and possibly improve the chances of a proposal being accepted by other authorities: a government Department may take up a demand with a Minister, or a Minister with the Cabinet. In particular, authorities often act as PARTISANS for some policy issue raised by them, or referred to them.(3) For example, Civil Servants act as partisans with their own Department and with their Ministers; Ministers themselves do so with their ministerial colleagues in Cabinet, or in their political party, in Parliament, and even in their own Department, if they choose to initiate their own policies.

Policy formation involves a series of inter-related activities - a flow of events and actions in time and space - rather than a single discrete decision taken in Parliament, Government or Civil Service. As Rose puts it, "The person who begins to study the process of policy formation by asking the question - 'Where does power lie?' - begins with the fallacious assumption that power must be located in some single, simple place. Variations in the context of policies cause variations in modes of policy formation." (Rose, 1969:xiv). Or, as Pollitt puts it, "Policies

are a process of decision-making and activity. They customarily involve a series of decisions taken over an extended period of time, an exercise of POWER and RATIONALITY. This process of decision-making takes place mainly, though not exclusively, within the framework of prescribed organisational roles. In the case of public policy, these roles are those constituting a series of formal institutions with special legal characteristics. These are the institutions of the state." (Pollitt, 1979:ix).

In party political terms, any set of decisions or recommendations about what ought to be done, or what will be done, when power changes hands, or the opportunity presents itself, constitutes a policy. Such policy statements of intent may be later endorsed in the form of an Act of Parliament, a Government White Paper, a ministerial statement in the House of Commons, or a directive to a group of Civil Servants. It goes without saying that these policy statements of intent are not sudden, overnight, affairs. The idea of continuous activity and adjustment involved in policy formation can best be conveyed by describing it as a PROCESS - the set of continuing relationships, the networks of interaction, among groups of decision-makers, rather than a single, once and for all, act. In the sense in which it is used in this thesis 'policy formation' is concerned with CONTENT - what the policy is, and PROCESS - how, and why, the policy is formed, and how the issues raised reach the political agenda, and are passed through the political and policy making system.(4)

## MODELS AND APPROACHES.

The study of policy formation, both in the United Kingdom and the United States, has taken various forms and generated a great deal of literature. As Salter and Tapper put it, "Considered in the round, policy making is less a coherent field of study and more a disparate conglomeration of approaches split among disciplinary and methodological lines. Definitions of what policy actually is vary, as do notions of where the process of policy making begins and ends." (Salter and Tapper, 1982:88). Suffice to say, the study of policy formation has been variously called 'policy sciences,' 'policy analysis' or 'policy advocacy.' A convenient distinction, for the purposes of this thesis, is between POLICY ANALYSIS, which attempts to describe the way in which policy decisions are made, and to explain the causes and consequences of a particular policy, and POLICY ADVOCACY, which attempts to prescribe what Governments should do in any given field of public policy. For example, Dye defines 'policy analysis' as, "A rigorous search for the causes and consequences of policies" (Dye, 1972:3); while Anderson defines 'policy advocacy' as, "What Governments should do, with the promotion of particular policies through discussion, persuasion and political activism." (Anderson, 1975:8).

The former - 'policy analysis' - concerned with explanation, may be defined as 'analysis of policy' and includes the study of:

a) policy content- what the policy is, how it emerged, and how it developed;

'b) policy process - how the policy was formed, and how the networks of interaction and the relationships between the various authorities and partisans operated in the policy area under consideration; and

c) policy outputs - what changes occurred in government policies, decisions and the allocation of resources, and why they occurred.

The latter - 'policy advocacy' - concerned with implementation, may be defined as 'analysis for policy' and includes activities aimed at gathering and collecting information and statistics for use by the policy and decision-makers, activities which are designed to improve the machinery of government and make decision-making more effective and efficient.

There are essentially two 'models' of policy formation. According to one model, policy formation is a logical and rational process: the administrative process as a

decision-making and goal attaining system. In this model an issue is identified, goals or objectives are established, a choice of the most desirable option is made, and this becomes policy. In this model objectives, and the values associated with them, are clarified before the means to the achievement are considered, and the best policy is the one which is judged to be the most appropriate means to a previously specified end. The origins of this 'rational' model of policy formation are best illustrated from the work of Downs and Simon.

Downs attempted to construct a theory of decision-making based on the concept of RATIONALITY - which he defined as the most efficient achievement of stated objectives. In so doing he hoped to improve the policy making process. (Downs, 1957; and Downs, 1967). Simon, with his concept of BOUNDED RATIONALITY, argued that policy formation is best viewed as a species of decision-making and that, as in all decision-making, there are three stages: detecting and specifying issues; inventing and developing possible ways of overcoming them; and choosing a course of action from those available. (Simon, 1965).

In short, according to the rational model of policy formation, an administrator ought to examine all possible courses of action open to him/her, trace through the consequences of each alternative course, and then separately evaluate the benefits

and costs of each alternative. S/he would then choose the greatest net-satisfaction. The object of the rational model of decision-making is the achievement of satisfactory, rather than optimum, results.

The other model of policy formation sees the administrative process as INCREMENTALISM. In this model Lindblom argued that it is inevitable, and desirable, that policy should be made within a very narrow spectrum of possible alternatives. His concept of MARGINAL INCREMENTALISM contended that a partisan in any situation cannot at best achieve more than very limited and non-radical changes of policy in the direction s/he prefers. His other concept of PARTISAN MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT asserted that the various viewpoints or interests which ought to be considered in policy formation would be better served through the accommodation reached between partisans, than through the determination of some supposedly unbiased and comprehensive decision-maker. Lindblom concluded that policy formation involved no more than limited, and mostly uncoordinated, adjustment to an existing situation, with authorities responding seriatim to the proposals of other partisans, or to unforeseen consequences of their decisions - DISJOINTED INCREMENTALISM. (Lindblom, 1965; and Lindblom, 1968).

In short, according to the 'incrementalist' model of policy

formation, decision-makers tend to work within a restricted framework of choice, departing from precedent only at the margin, one step at a time. According to this model, the best criterion of a policy is whether it commands adequate agreement - CONSENSUS -not what goals it achieves.

In many ways the 'rational model' of policy formation is concerned with the way in which the political system should work, rather than the way it actually does work. As Rhodes puts it, "The rational model can best be seen as a prescriptive statement as to how decisions ought to be taken, whereas the other (incrementalist model) qualifies the prescription by describing how decisions are actually taken." (Rhodes, 1979:35).

Some would even argue that to work out over-riding objectives is impossible and wrong, and never happens anyway. As Lindblom puts it, "It assumes intellectual capacities and sources of information that men simply do not possess, and is even more absurd as an approach to policy when the time and money that can be allocated to a policy issue is limited, as is always the case." (Lindblom, 1959:54). Far better, it is argued, to assume that change will occur 'incrementally' as a result of pressure from the interest groups on the decision-makers, and thus lead to decisions which are feasible and acceptable, rather than

those based on unrealistic dreams of an unpredictable future.

In the United Kingdom policy formation has usually been regarded as being in line with the incrementalist model. Indeed, it has often appeared to be the almost irrational and accidental outcome of many different pressures and pressure groups, often with different objectives, and often in conflict with each other. That this is the case is due, in part, to the distributed and pluralist nature of the political system in the United Kingdom, involving as it does the interplay, interaction and conflict of the roles, ideas and opinions of Parliament and Government, Ministers and Civil Servants, Local Authorities and Pressure Groups, so that the political process which leads to decisions and changes in policy is often complicated, and sometimes obscure. As one former Minister has put it, "Modern British government and politics are run, in fact, collectively through a huge network of interlocking committees, consultation and conferences. Even though they originate in the mind of an individual, they have to be argued out with others and agreed by them, and they will not be accepted until they have gone through that process." (A Wedgewood Benn, *Guardian*, 10 September 1978). However, as this thesis will illustrate, this political process became subject to greater rationalisation during the period in question, between 1963 and 1973, and the consensus model of policy formation underwent considerable



changes.

Until recently there were only two approaches to the study of policy formation - the CASE STUDY APPROACH and the PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH. The 'case study approach' ostensibly sought to explain the 'why' of an accomplished policy: the 'programmatic approach' sought to identify policy with a set of programme choices, among which was sought the most efficient means of employing scarce resources. The most notable manifestation of the programmatic approach has been the PPBS - the 'planning, programming, budgeting system'. In PPBS one generally tries to identify the objectives of the government agency, to relate costs and budgetary decisions to these objectives and, thereby, to assess the cost-effectiveness of present and proposed programmes. One of the most important examples of PPBS in the United Kingdom in the period under consideration in this thesis was in the field of education, with the attempt at 'output budgeting' in the Department of Education and Science. (DES, 1970:Planning Paper, No.1)).

This thesis adopts a third approach, pioneered by Heclo, the 'analytic-realistic approach.' "The challenge is not to decompose process or content, but to find relationships which link the two, not to reify collectivities into individual deciders, but to understand the 'networks of interaction' by

which policies result. A perspective which views policy in terms of learning and adaptation offers, I believe, the greatest promise for advances in policy studies which will be both analytic and realistic." (Heclo, 1972:106).

This approach is the right one if one accepts the view that policy should be defined so as to relate, not simply to direct decisions, but to courses of action through time and space, and to outcomes which no one intended or decided upon. Also, if one accepts the view that policy is what is left undone, as well as what is done. As Harman puts it, "Policy is a course of action, or inaction, towards the accomplishment of some intended, or desired, end." (Harman, 1978:5).

## Chapter 2. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES

## NOTES

1. According to Easton, the main stress or disturbance to which the political system is subject consists of those 'wants' of members of society whose fulfilment appears to require an authoritative allocation. Wants do not automatically become allocations since they are filtered both at the point of entry into the system - and in their path through it - by gate-keepers, such as interest and pressure groups, political parties and administrators. Wants are reduced through collection and combination into a common 'demand': they are both broadened in scope and pruned to a more restricted number on which attention can be focused. Thus those wants which succeed in entering the policy-making system become 'demands'. A demand, therefore, is a want which has reached the political agenda as a basis for political decision. (Easton, 1965:57).

2. According a House of Commons Select Committee, "Ministers are responsible to Parliament for policy, and any extension to the accountability of Civil Servants must recognise the over-riding responsibility of the departmental Minister for the work and efficiency of his Department." (Select Committee, 1977).

3. In Gamson's definition, "AUTHORITIES are those who, for any given social system, make binding decision on that system: PARTISANS are that set of actors who, for a given decision, are affected by the outcome in some significant way." (Gamson, 1968:21-22).

4. According to Easton, the policy making system consists of, "That set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behaviour through which values are authoritatively allocated for society." (Easton, 1965:57). Political interactions are distinguished from other interactions because they are predominantly orientated towards these authoritative allocations, the latter being seen as the 'outputs' of the

political system. Outputs customarily take the form of government policies, decisions and implementing actions.

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson, J E (1975), Public Policy Making. Nelson. (Basic concepts in political science).
- Cobb, R W and Elder, C D (1972), Participation in American Politics: the dynamics of agenda building. Allyn & Bacon.
- DES (1970), Output Budgeting for the Department of Education and Science: report of a feasibility study. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper No.1)
- Downs, A (1957), An Economic Theory of Democracy. Harper.
- Downs, A (1963), Inside Bureaucracy. Little Brown.
- Dye, T R (1972), Understanding Public Policy. Prentice Hall.
- Easton, D (1965), A Framework for Political Analysis. University of Chicago.
- Gamson, W A (1968), Power and Discontent. Dorsey.
- Hall, P (1975), Change, Choice and Conflict in Social Policy. Heineman.
- Harman, G (1978), 'Policy Making and Policy Processes in Education', in Farquahar, R H and Housego, I E (1978), Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration. University of British Columbia.
- Heclo, H H (1972), 'Policy Analysis'. British Journal of Political Studies, 2, pp.83-108.
- House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1977), The Civil Service. (Eleventh Report). HMSO. (HC 535).
- Lindblom, C E (1959), 'The Science of Muddling Through. Public Administration Review, 19, pp.50-59.
- Lindblom, C E (1965), The Intelligence of Democracy; decision making through mutual adjustment. Collier MacMillan.
- Lindblom, C E (1968), The Policy Making Process. Prentice Hall.
- Pollitt, C (1979), Public Policy in Theory and Practice. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Rhodes, R A W (1979), Public Administration and Policy Analysis: recent developments in Britain and America. Gower.
- Rose, R (1969), Policy Making in Britain: a reader in government. Macmillan.

Salter, B and Tapper, T (1982), Education, Politics and the State: the theory and practice of educational change. MacIntyre.

Simon, H A (1965), Administrative Behaviour: a study of decision making processes. Macmillan.

Solesbury, W (1975), 'The Environmental Agenda: an illustration of how situations become political issues and may demand responses from Government; or how they may not'. Public Administration, 53. 3, pp.381-410.

### Chapter 3. POLICY FORMATION IN EDUCATION, 1963-73.

"The evolution of educational policy in its broadest sense is the result of a complex political process. Power is widely diffused. On the other hand, central Government control has grown in response to both the sheer size of the education budget and its political importance." (Taylor, 1973:211).

In the field of education both the authorities and the partisans are numerous, since education - because of the social opportunities it bestows, the economic resources it consumes and the political controversy it causes - is of concern to Parliament and Government, Ministers and Civil Servants, and the various pressure groups, such as Local Education Authorities and the organised Associations of teachers, students and parents. As Howell and Brown point out, "Policy making in education does have certain features which distinguish it from policy making in other fields. Notably, it manifests a concern for specifically educational values, which at times take precedent even over considerations such as resource costs; it takes place in a decentralised system of government, in which the providing institutions, and those associated with them, have considerable autonomy." (Howell and Brown, 1983:15).

Since educational policy formation cannot really be understood or considered independently of the machinery for administration, control and scrutiny within which it takes place, this thesis begins with an examination of the FRAMEWORK

in which educational policies, including policies for the education, training and supply of teachers, were made in England and Wales during the period 1963 to 1973, and then goes on to describe the PROCESS of educational policy formation itself.

#### THE FRAMEWORK OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY.

Government Departments are the main instrument for giving effect to government policy when Parliament has passed the necessary legislation. The Minister of Education had, until recently, by law to submit an annual account of the exercise and performance of the power and duties conferred and imposed upon him by the Education Act 1944. Such Annual Reports, in education as in other areas of administration and government, are one of the means by which Parliament has the opportunity to scrutinize and examine the work of Government, and review the decisions of those who make policy - Ministers and Civil Servants in their Departments. (Kogan, 1975:149). Other means are by way of parliamentary Debates and Questions, and, in particular, by the work of parliamentary Select Committees.(1)

At the beginning of the period under consideration, the political head of the Education Department was the Minister of Education, who had been a member of the Cabinet since 1959. As expenditure on education grew, as education became more and more a centre of national attention, and as serious rethinking on the structure of the education system moved forward, the political importance of the Minister of Education increased. As

Taylor and Saunders put it, "There is little doubt that the alterations of 1944 and 1964 to the title of the Head of the Department of Education, and in the extent of his duties, have added to the prestige of the office, and have effectively guaranteed him a place in the Cabinet. These changes reflect the increased importance and growing cost of education in the national life and economy." (Taylor and Saunders, 1976). By the middle of the 1960s the office of the political head of the Education Department had emerged, in Manzer's words, "Into the position of leadership and authority which had been created by Butler in his 1944 legislation, but which had never been fulfilled in fact." (Manzer, 1970:6).

Under the 1944 Education Act the Minister of Education was made accountable to Parliament for, "Promoting the education of the people of England and Wales, and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose, and for securing the effective execution by Local Education Authorities under his control and direction of national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area." (Education Act, 1944:section 1).

In particular, with regard to the training and supply of teachers, the Minister of Education was given specific duties and responsibilities: "The Minister of Education shall make such arrangements as he considers expedient for securing that there should be available sufficient facilities for the training of teachers for service in schools, colleges and other establishments maintained by Local Education Authorities, and



for that purpose the Minister of Education may give to any Local Education Authority such directions as he thinks necessary, requiring them to establish, maintain or assist any training college or other institution, or to provide or assist the provision of any other institution, or to provide or assist the provision of any other facilities specified in this direction." (Education Act, 1944:section 62).

At the beginning of the period under consideration in this thesis, the vast majority of teachers were trained and supplied by the 'Teacher Training Colleges', controlled by Local Education Authorities or Voluntary Bodies - totalling nearly 54,000 teachers in 1963. In addition, some 3,500 graduates each year were given 'post graduate teacher training' in the Education Departments of twenty Universities. (Table 2). The latter, being autonomous institutions, were not responsible, directly or indirectly, to the Local Education Authorities. Since 1919, the Universities had received their finance through the 'University Grants Committee (UGC)', which was responsible to the Treasury.

In 1967 - under the 'Teacher Training Regulations' - the Secretary of State for Education and Science was given the power to:

- a) recognise and approve institutions in which initial teacher training could be provided;
- b) determine the number of students in training in each institution;

- c) determine the nature of courses which were taught in them;
- d) specify the length of course taught; and
- e) lay down the minimum entrance requirements and the minimum age of entry. (DES, 1967, SI 792).

It was this power to regulate the supply, content and control of teacher training which was to account for the changes in policy proposed for the Colleges of Education in 1972-73.

The Minister of Education, in exercising his overall responsibility for the education service was, until 1968, advised by two 'Central Advisory Councils for Education' (CACs) - one for England and one for Wales, whose duty it was to advise the Minister of Education upon such matters connected with educational theory and practice as they thought fit, and upon any question referred to them by him. (Education Act, 1944:section 4). In particular, in fulfilling his responsibilities for the training and supply of teachers, the Minister of Education was advised by the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST), which had been established in 1949 to advise the Minister of Education on policy for ensuring that the country's schools would be properly and adequately staffed. (PEP, 1960:163; and Kogan & Packwood, 1974:21).

The original purpose of NACTST, as outlined in its First Report, was to keep under review national policy on the training and qualifications of teachers, and on their recruitment and distribution in ways best calculated to meet

the needs of the schools and other establishments.(2) These objectives, as this thesis will examine, became modified by events and NACTST became preoccupied with problems of supply and recruitment.

Both the CACs and NACTST may be described as 'standing' or 'statutory' Advisory Committees, in that they had a perpetual life accorded them by statute or ministerial fiat, as opposed to the 'ad hoc' or 'departmental' Advisory Committees or Committees of Inquiry which were appointed by Ministers, and which disappeared when their remit was discharged. Such Advisory Committees and Committees of Inquiry, whether of a 'permanent' nature or appointed on an 'ad hoc' basis, were a regular feature of the educational policy making process during the period under consideration. The exact function, character and role of such Committees in the formation of policies for the education, training and supply of teachers will be examined as this thesis proceeds.

When the political head of the Education Department was a Minister, the senior Civil Servant in the Department of Education was called the 'Permanent Secretary' - but when, in 1964, the political head became the 'Secretary of State for Education and Science', then the senior Civil Servant became the Permanent (Under) Secretary at the newly created 'Department of Education and Science'(DES). The Permanent (Under) Secretary was responsible to the Secretary of State for the organisation of the Department, and for the advice it gave him. In the words of Lord Bridges, a former Head of the Civil

Service, "The Minister of any Department is bound to be preoccupied with the wide range of work which his position involves - his parliamentary duties, his discussions with his Cabinet colleagues, and his contacts with his constituency, and with national bodies. It must be for the Permanent Secretary, whose working life centres in the Department, to see that he himself, and the Department as a whole, are working in harmony with the Minister's ideas." (Manzer, 1970:7).

The other officials of the Education Department, in common with those of other government Departments - or of any large bureaucracy - were organised on a hierarchical basis. Below the Permanent (Under) Secretary came various Deputy (Under) Secretaries, one of whom was responsible for higher education, including teacher training and supply, and below them were Assistant (Under) Secretaries, each of whom was responsible for one or more of the Branches and Sub-Branched into which the Department of Education was divided. Such Branches and Sub-Branched were not necessarily permanent, or fixed. (Kogan, 1971:8-9; and Gosden, 1966:216). Below Assistant Secretary, in descending order of rank, came Senior Principals, Principals, Clerical Officers and Clerical Assistants.

No discussion of the framework in which educational policies were made between 1963 and 1973 would be complete without an examination of the main organisations likely to be concerned with such policies, namely the 'Local Education Authorities' and the 'Teachers' Associations'. Such organisations have been classified in several ways. For example, a central distinction

has often been made between organisations which seek primarily to defend the professional, economic or social interests of their members, or their own particular section of society, and those who seek to promote a cause. (Hanson and Walles, 1970:150). Conventionally, such 'sectional groups' are called 'interest groups, and 'promotional groups' are called 'pressure groups'. (Finer, 1966:3).

However, the distinction between sectional and promotional groups is not always clear cut, since many sectional groups also indulge in promotional activities. Here the Teachers' Associations and the Local Education Authorities are themselves the most relevant examples, since they straddle the division between sectional and promotional groups. A far better definition, following Kimber and Richardson, is simply to call them all 'pressure groups': "A pressure group may be regarded as any group which articulates a demand that the authorities in the political system, or sub-system, should make an authoritative allocation of resources in their favour." (Kimber and Richardson, 1974:2).

According to Kogan, it is also possible to make a distinction between 'legitimised' and 'non-legitimised' pressure groups in education. (Kogan, 1975:75). Pressure groups are legitimised if they have a statutory or conventional right to be consulted by Government on matters affecting their membership, or the education service as a whole. Whether such a distinction is useful, or even possible, is a matter for debate, particularly since few pressure groups have a statutory right to be

consulted, and since consultation about policy initiatives is at the grace and favour of the Government in the first instance, which even Kogan himself admits: "While the right to be consulted often has a legal base - it is never specific, and the decision to consult is in the gift, formerly, of the Secretary of State." (Kogan, 1975:75). From the point of view of teacher education, training and supply, it is more convenient to divide the pressure groups into two - 'Local Education Authority Associations' and 'Teachers Associations'.

During the period between 1963 and 1973 the Local Education Authorities in England and Wales belonged to three national bodies - the 'Association of Municipal Corporations' (AMC), the 'County Councils Association' (CCA), and the 'Association of Education Committees' (AEC), the last representing the statutory 'Education Committee' of each Local Education Authority, and comprising one third Education Officers and two thirds locally elected Councillors.(3) These national Associations represented the Local Authorities in their collective dealings with the Department of Education and Science, and the Teachers' Associations.

The Local Education Authorities had certain duties and powers under the 1944 Education Act. In particular, with regard to the training and supply of teachers, they had a duty to provide and maintain schools and colleges, and employ teachers, and to ensure that there was sufficient education at all levels - primary, secondary and further - to meet the needs of their local population. (Education Act, 1944: sections 8 & 62).

At the time of the Robbins Report in 1963, three out of every four teachers in schools belonged to one or more of the eight major Teachers' Associations - the 'National Union of Teachers' (NUT), the 'National Association of Schoolmasters' (NAS), the 'National Association of Head Teachers' (NAHT), the 'Joint Four Associations' - the 'Assistant Masters Association' (AMA), the 'Association of Assistant Mistresses' (AAM), the 'Head Masters' Association' (HMA), and the 'Association of Head Mistresses' (AHM) - and the 'Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions' (ATTI).

In 1963, in the field of higher education, there were the 'Association of University Teachers' (AUT), and the 'Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals of University Institutions' (CVCP), while in the field of teacher training was the 'Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education' (ATCDE). Later, in 1967, there was created the 'Universities Council for the Education of Teachers' (UCET), comprising all the Universities with Schools, Departments or Institutes of Education, together with representatives from the ATCDE. The UCET rapidly developed a role as the spokesman for the 'university interest' in teacher education and training, and was regarded as such by the CVCP. When the UCET met officials from the Department of Education and Science, representatives from CVCP attended as observers. The combined support of CVCP, UCET and ATCDE ensured 'university representation' on the Weaver Study Group on the government of Colleges of Education. (DES, 1966, Weaver Report).

This, then, was the 'framework' in which educational policy was formed between 1963 and 1973. It is now time to examine how the various authorities and partisans described above acted, interacted and reacted in the 'process' of educational policy formation during the period under consideration.



## THE FORMATION OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY

According to Manzer, there was at the beginning of the period in question a 'sub-system' - within the overall political system - in which most decisions about national education policy were made within a tripartite structure, involving the Ministry of Education, the Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations. (Manzer, 1970:1). Manzer's view, however, ignores the fact that on occasions the Minister of Education was an 'authority' and on others a 'partisan' - and that educational policies had to be subordinated by the Prime Minister, the Cabinet and the Treasury to total government financial, economic and social policy. (Kogan, 1975:235). This became particularly true, as this thesis will examine, as the 1960s progressed.

For example, prices and incomes policies - policies designed to enable the Government to manage the economy more efficiently - cannot be changed by deputations to the Ministry of Education, or discussions within the education sub-system. Slow economic growth and the need to switch resources from domestic consumption into exports left little room for manoeuvre by 1969. As will be seen later, financial restraint and the economic crises of the late 1960s were to lead to cutbacks in 'public expenditure programmes' and were to have considerable influence on policies for the education, training and supply of teachers.(4)

The influence of Parliament and parliamentary Select Committees

on the process of educational policy is not always easy to trace, as Kogan has found. (Kogan, 1975:149-182). On major issues, where the Government has already announced its intentions, and its majority is secure, opposition in Parliament is unlikely to effect any substantial change. (Kogan, 1971:165). Bills may be amended on points of detail as the result of parliamentary debate or scrutiny, but on issues of principle the Government usually stands firm. For example, Antony Crosland's decision to increase the fees of overseas students at British Universities aroused great opposition in Parliament: even many Labour MPs abstained in the voting. The Government did not change its policy. (Kogan, 1971:178).

In general, also, there are few debates in Parliament on education. (Kogan, 1971:166; and Fowler, 1979:14). When such debates do occur, the main function of Parliament is to articulate public opinion and anxiety. As Kogan puts it, "Parliament at most reviews, criticises and helps to aggregate and articulate feelings about policy. Essentially, it reacts to, rather than initiates, policy." (Kogan, 1975:25). An example of this will be seen below, in the debate leading to the setting up of the Robbins Committee on 'Higher Education'.

During the period between 1963 and 1973 parliamentary Select Committees underwent several important changes, both in organisation and in role. In 1966, Richard Crossman, then Leader of the House of Commons, proposed the establishment of specialist committees of Members of Parliament to examine in detail specific areas of administration in government

Departments. (Brown, 1970:104-112). One of the new specialist committees was the 'House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science', which collected evidence, examined witnesses and issued reports on various aspects of education, including teacher training, in the 1966-70 Parliament. (Select Committee, 1968, 1969 & 1970).

In 1969, the House of Commons Select Committee on Procedure proposed that the former 'Estimates Committee' of the House should be replaced by a new 'Select Committee on Expenditure'. (Select Committee on Procedure, 1969). This new Select Committee on Expenditure was to set up eight Sub-Committees, and each Sub-Committee was to be allocated a particular sphere of government. The terms of reference of the Select Committee and its Sub-Committees were to be much wider than those of the previous Select Committee on Estimates. In particular, it was suggested that the Sub-Committees should be empowered to consider the activities of the Departments of State within its field, as well as the estimates of departmental expenditure. They would also be responsible for examining the implications of the policy chosen by Ministers, and of assessing the success of Departments in attaining their objectives.

The new Select Committee on Expenditure was first set up early in 1971. Its terms of reference were similar to those of the former Select Committee on Estimates, except that they gave the Select Committee power to consider policy in the Departments of State. Now, for the first time, Parliament could examine seriously - and in detail - not only the public expenditure

implications of policy, but also the procedures for estimating forward commitments and planning to meet them. Thus, for example, the 'Education and Arts Sub-Committee' of the Select Committee on Expenditure first examined what was the planning machinery for education. (Select Committee on Expenditure, 1971, Second Report). Subsequently, the Select Committee concentrated on higher education, suggesting the creation of new organs of planning and control. (Select Committee on Expenditure, 1972). In 1975, prompted by a report from the 'Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development' (OECD) on 'educational development strategy in England and Wales', the Select Committee on Expenditure, through its Education and Arts Sub-Committee, decided to examine 'policy making in the Department of Education and Science.' (Select Committee on Expenditure, 1976, Tenth Report).

Whether Select Committees of Parliament have any real influence on the formation of educational policy, however, is a matter for debate. (Kogan, 1975:234). The Select Committee on Education and Science, for example, censured the Department of Education and Science for inadequate intervention in Local Education Authority control of colleges. (Select Committee, 1969). Here the DES became no more interventionist. In 1970, the Select Committee on Education and Science - like the Robbins Committee before it - proposed the setting up of a 'Higher Education Commission' to supervise the administration of the whole of higher education. (Select Committee, 1970). Like the recommendation of the Robbins Committee it was again rejected by the Government. The Select Committee on Expenditure

repeated the proposal in 1972. (Select Committee on Expenditure, 1972). It was again rejected by the Government.

In the case of Select Committees of Parliament, their main importance, as far as policy formation in education is concerned, lies in the evidence they collect and the internal workings of Government they reveal, since Ministers and Civil Servants from the Department of Education and Science have to justify in public the administrative arrangements for which they are responsible, and to state - both in writing and in the exchange of dialogue - how they implement policy, which can be held up for scrutiny by the Select Committee. (Kogan, 1975:174). The reports of both the Select Committee on Education and Science and the Select Committee on Expenditure provide invaluable evidence and insight into the making of policy in education, prior to the 1972 White Paper - 'Education: a framework for expansion.'

Also, on occasions, parliamentary Select Committees do provoke a formal response from Government to the issues raised in their Reports. (DES, 1976, The Government's Reply to the Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee). For example, the Tenth Report of the Select Committee on Expenditure - 'Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science' - which criticised the excessive secrecy of the DES in its deliberations leading up to the publication of the 1972 White Paper - 'Education: a framework for expansion' - produced a generally sympathetic response from the Secretary of State for Education and Science, together with some action, such as the publication of some

statistical projections and several consultative documents on broad policy issues. (Fowler, 1979:17).

Finally, in Parliament, one of the most fertile areas for new policies in the field of education was the individual political party. For example, as this thesis will examine later, it was the Labour Party - while in Opposition - which came to favour the separate development of higher education, and which, when elected in 1964, put forward a 'binary policy' for higher education. Similarly, the Conservative Party - again in Opposition - supported proposals for the reform of teacher training and, when elected in 1970, proceeded to set up the James Committee.

In the area of Government the Treasury, in particular, from 1963, began to have great influence on educational policy, since it came more and more - in the interests of macro-economic policy - to take a closer look at such large programmes of public expenditure by one of the biggest spending Departments of State. (Kogan, 1971:163; and Pile, 1974:14). Each year, from 1962 onwards, the Government began to undertake a review of public expenditure programmes, including education, in the light of existing and prospective economic conditions. It published its plans for the five years ahead in a annual 'Public Expenditure' White Paper. In dealing with financial resources the Department of Education had to act within the estimates set for it. Consequently, any decisions taken by Ministers for education, which had implications for public expenditure, had to be negotiated through the 'Public

Expenditure Survey Committee' (PESC) machinery, established in 1962, which in turn meant that the Treasury had to be associated with the process of policy formation within the Department of Education and Science.(5)

The importance of the Treasury in educational policy formation may be illustrated by the fact that no policy proposal would be accepted for discussion by the Cabinet, or by a Cabinet Committee, unless it has first been discussed with the Treasury. (Fowler, 1979:24). As a result, there was normally a great deal of discussion at official level between the spending Departments of State, such as the Department of Education and the Treasury. This was followed by bi-lateral discussions between spending Ministers and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. (Kogan, 1971:167). Inevitably, as Rose points out, "The proportion of policy making officials in the Treasury is much greater than in any other Department of State." (Rose, 1969:364).

In addition to the Treasury, the Minister of Education had to relate his policies, and those of his Department, to those of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, and others at the apex of the government machine. Conventionally, it was the Prime Minister who appointed and removed Ministers, including Ministers of Education. For example, the decision whether there should be one, or two, Ministers of Education in 1964 - following the recommendations of the Robbins Report - was reserved to the Prime Minister, because of the convention that s/he has sole concern with ministerial appointments. Similarly,

only the Prime Minister had the right to shape areas of ministerial responsibility, as Harold Wilson did when he combined the areas of Education and Science. Such decisions gave the Prime Minister ultimate responsibility and authority over educational government and policy formation.

This, and economic considerations, apart, however, few specifically educational issues ever concern the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Education is rarely mentioned in Harold Wilson's account of his period in office as Prime Minister, between 1964 and 1970. (Wilson, 1971). As Secretary of State for Education and Science between 1965 and 1967, for example, Antony Crosland only submitted two educational issues to the Cabinet: his Circular on comprehensive education, and his appointment of the 'Public Schools Commission' - whereas some issues, foreign policy, defence, economics, came automatically to the Cabinet. Under normal circumstances, as Kogan points out, the focal point of educational policy making is the individual Minister of Education. (Kogan, 1971:36).

According to Gladden, policy formation is the main task of a Minister, a task which s/he shares with his/her few ministerial colleagues. (Gladden, 1967:iii). S/he is involved in the initiation of policy, which s/he takes to the Cabinet, if necessary, and in the implementation of this policy when it has been approved by the Cabinet.(6) However, no Minister of Education can formulate policy on his/her own. The ability of even the most able Minister to initiate, promote and carry out policy will be limited. It is unlikely that a Minister can



control all the activities, let alone all the policy initiatives, in a Department such as the Department of Education. (Kogan, 1971:41).

First, time will be against him/her. As Antony Crosland, a former Secretary of State for Education and Science, has expressed it: "What you will not be able to do is to get round every chunk of departmental policy and approve, or alter, it - as the case may be. There will be chunks of the Department and of departmental policy which you have really not had time to look at all." (Kogan, 1971:41).

Second, it inevitably takes time and expertise to work out, and work through, a new pattern of education policy. It has been estimated, for example, that the time available to Ministers to understand their jobs would mean that a new Minister would require eighteen months before s/he was fully in control of his/her Ministry. Indeed, according to Lord Crowther-Hunt, a former Minister of State for Education, Ministers, if they governed effectively, were faced with an enormous decision-making load - about two hundred and sixty decisions a week, of which at least ten per cent required detailed consideration. It could take three hours for each decision to be properly considered. (Hencke, 1977:13; and Hencke, 1978:109). Such time and expertise is unlikely to be acquired by a politician moved between the Board of Trade and the Treasury, and the Department of Education every few years. (Kogan, 1971:43). As a result, the balance of power tended to be with Civil Servants, who knew more about issues than

Ministers did, and tended to shape them in their direction. (Select Committee, 1976:1389).

Thus, the heavy burdens of departmental business, the varied role expectations of the political head of the Education Department - as a Minister, a member of the Cabinet, a member of Parliament, and a constituency representative, together with the limited number of junior Ministers in the Department of Education, meant inevitably that Senior Civil Servants had an important role to play in the process of policy making.(7)

During the period under consideration in this thesis, policy was largely formulated in the Department of Education by some sixty Civil Servants, many of whom - of Assistant (Under) Secretary rank, or higher - served in the Department of Education for ten years, or more. (Kogan, 1971:40 & 234). For example, between 1962 and 1972, the Civil Servants in the 'Teacher Supply and Training Branch' of the Department of Education were under the control of Toby Weaver, the Deputy (Under) Secretary responsible for higher education. As a witness before the Select Committee on Expenditure put it, "A very important influence was exercised by one particular Civil Servant. There can be little doubt that the Civil Servant was Toby Weaver." (Select Committee, 1976:681). Because of their permanent position such senior Civil Servants acquired a high degree of expertise and authority, so much so, that one senior official at the Department of Education claimed: "I can honestly say that there is not one new policy in my sector of responsibility that I have not either started, or substantially

contributed to, over the last twenty years." (Kogan, 1971:41).

Many points of policy will often be initiated by Civil Servants themselves, through memoranda and meetings, or in discussions between Civil Servants and the Minister, in which case they act as partisans with the political authority. (Kogan, 1971:40). For example, according to Edward Boyle, former Minister of Education, the policy to expand teacher training in 1963 was largely attributable to a brief prepared by William Pile, at that time Assistant (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education, in charge of teacher supply. (Kogan, 1971:138). Also, as Antony Crosland has stated, an Assistant (Under) Secretary put forward many of the points in the 'fourteen point programme' on teacher supply which he advocated as Secretary of State for Education and Science in 1965. (Kogan, 1971:53 & 191). Finally, as this thesis will examine later, it was a Civil Servant who first formulated the 'binary policy' in higher education - a policy which was to have a profound effect on the control of teacher education, training and supply. (Kogan, 1971:52 & 193).

The above, and similar examples, have led Kogan to conclude that policy making is continually in the hands of Civil Servants, who create - as it were - 'low frequency policy waves.' Ministers bring with them 'high frequency activity' which can initiate, change, strengthen, or condemn a whole policy. (Kogan, 1971:42). As this thesis will examine later, it was the 'high frequency activity' of Margaret Thatcher, as Secretary of State for Education and Science, which led in 1970

- to the setting up of the 'James Committee' on teacher education and training.

Finally, Civil Servants are policy makers at second remove, since one of their main duties is to provide the best advice and information from the data and research available, which is essential to effective policy making.(8) The need for such advice became more necessary during the period under consideration with the tendency for policy formation to pass from 'external' Advisory Committees, and to be carried out 'within' the Department of Education and Science. With the growing complexity of government and administration, the process of policy formation itself became more complex, as it came to depend more and more upon a mass of technical, economic and, above all, demographic data, which had to be assembled, often in statistical form, before the issue in question could be adequately tackled. (Gladden, 1967:245). Such 'rationality' - as will be examined later in this thesis - was a development of the 1960s: not until the middle of the 1960s did the Department of Education and Science have a separate 'Statistics' or 'Teacher Supply' Branch. A small 'Planning Branch' - staffed by economists and statisticians, as well as by administrators, was set up within the Department of Education and Science by Antony Crosland in 1966. (Kogan, 1975:71).

The growth and development of the various 'Planning Units' within the Department of Education and Science, and the consequent increase in 'rationality' in the educational policy making process, will be examined at the appropriate place in

this thesis. Suffice to say at the moment that it is claimed that such 'rationalisation' of the policy making process had a profound effect on the relationship between the authorities and partisans, both within, and without, the education sub-system. As Gerry Fowler, a former Minister of State for Education and Science has put it, "The more effective such procedures for guiding Ministers in the allocation of resources become, the less the success of outside interest and pressure groups in influencing them. The stronger are formal systems for policy analysis and evaluation in the government of education, the more doubtful becomes the autonomy of teachers and academics in deciding what they will do, and how." (Fowler, 1974:43).

If any partisan, or any outside interest or pressure group, wished to influence educational policy at national level during the period under consideration, their activities had clearly to be designed to persuade, directly or indirectly, the Minister of Education, his/her Civil Servants and - through them - the rest of the government authority. No study of the process of educational policy making can, therefore, ignore the constant persuasion which such pressure groups, both privately and publically, exercised at all levels of the educational system. One of the main pressure groups in this 'education lobby' - the 'Teachers' Associations' - has always tried to influence educational policy in numerous ways, and at every level of its formation and implementation.

Teachers' Associations have tried to bring influence to bear on the policy making process in various ways - by deputations, lobbying and canvassing, publicity and public relations, by what Coates calls, "The traditional forms of group pressure." (Coates, 1972:8). The Teachers' Associations regularly sent letters, pamphlets and memoranda to Members of Parliament, Government Ministers and Civil Servants in the Department of Education, and, on occasions, they organised petitions. Teachers' Associations also made frequent use of private meetings with Members of Parliament, and especially with Committees and Education Groups of political parties. In 1962, for example, the National Union of Teachers (NUT) created a 'Parliamentary Committee' to keep a watching brief on parliamentary legislation, or incipient legislation, affecting teachers or teachers' interests, to propose draft amendments to parliamentary Bills, or proposed Bills, and to maintain contact with Union sponsored Members of Parliament. (Finer, 1966:47). The House of Commons itself contained a large number of ex-teachers who could be relied upon, within the constraints of party discipline, to express the teachers' case in debate.(9).

Pressure of the above kind was usually supported by regular and formal contacts between the Officials of the Teachers' Associations and the Civil Servants in the Department of Education. In addition, there was a great deal of personal and informal contact between the Teachers' Associations and Civil Servants. In Coates' words, "A constant stream of draft circulars, and requests for opinion, advice, even at times assistance, finds its way from the Department of Education to

the Teachers' Associations; and Department of Education Civil Servants, on occasions, visit Teachers' Associations headquarters to discuss proposed policy." (Coates, 1972:11). Thus, traditionally, officials of the Department of Education and the Teachers' Associations sought, and received, each others' reactions and opinions on all aspects of educational policy at an early stage in its formation - or so it was generally and conventionally believed. (Locke, 1974:28).

A further part of the process of consultation and achieving 'consensus' was that the Department of Education sent out drafts of its proposed circulars for comment. As Morris put it, "It is customary in Britain for government Departments to produce trial drafts of proposed developments or changes in policy, which they circulate to interested parties, such as Local Education Authorities and Teachers' Associations. This enables a Minister to test consumer reaction to his/her proposals and to widen the area of technical advice on which s/he bases his conclusions. Preliminary drafts of proposals which affect education are submitted to the Teachers' Associations as a matter of course, and the Associations are able to comment freely upon them." (Morris, 1968:69). For example, the comments by the National Union of Teachers on Circular 10/65, on comprehensive reorganisation of secondary education, persuaded Antony Crosland, when Secretary of State for Education and Science, to include the need for Local Education Authorities to consult Teachers' Associations in preparing plans for comprehensive education. (Locke, 1974:28). However, the actual evidence for this belief with regard to the

process of policy formation for the education, training and supply of teachers will be examined as this thesis proceeds.(10)

Teachers' Associations also tried to bring their influence to bear on the educational policy making process by their membership of, and their evidence to, the various 'Advisory Committes' on education. As Manzer puts it, "Many important policy proposals are developed through the Advisory Committees and, while the securing of implementation is usually a lengthy and complicated process, they constitute a basic method of building consensus in educational policy." (Manzer, 1970:15). These Advisory Committees, as already mentioned, were basically of two kinds: 'permanent' committees, such as the Central Advisory Councils (CACs) and the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (NACTST), to which the Teachers' Associations had the right of direct nomination, and 'ad hoc' committees and working parties, made up of representatives from the Department of Education, the Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations, to discuss specific policy issues. Two examples of the latter are - the Study Group on the 'Government of Colleges of Education,' and the Working Party on 'A Teaching Council for England and Wales.' (DES, 1966, Weaver Report; and DES, 1970, Weaver Report).

The Teachers' Associations, in common with a large number of other educational pressure groups, submitted written and oral evidence to parliamentary Select Committees and government



Committees of Inquiry. The latter, such as the Robbins Committee and the James Committee, as Bates puts it, "Are appointed by the Government with broad terms of reference, led by a man or woman of eminence. Evidence from all interested parties is submitted to the Committee, which then produces a Report with a list of recommendations. There then follows a period of public debate and subsequent government action - or inaction." (Bates, 1973:4).

Finally, the growing awareness of the role being played by government policies for the management of the economy contributed to the move by the Teachers' Associations into a wider political arena in the 1960s. This was because the education 'sub-system' became more constrained by events and happenings outside the education sector, notably the cut-backs in government public expenditure programmes, as a result of the national economic crises in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As Coates put it, "Government policy in the 1960s reduced the range of issues on which the Department of Education was free to respond to the reasoned arguments of the Teachers' Associations. The Teachers' Associations then turned to new or revised strategy and tactics, in order to strengthen their position before the Department, and to win influence over policy made outside the education sector". (Coates, 1972:32-33, and 36).

Within the above framework, and within the above process, it is now time to examine the formation of policies for the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales

between 1963 and 1973.

## Chapter 3. NOTES AND REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. According to Wheare, "The function of Parliament and its Select Committees is to scrutinise and control the administration and accountability of Government." (Wheare, 1955).
2. The objectives of the teacher education and training system may be summed up as: to provide an adequate number of adequately trained teachers for all the schools in England and Wales. All too often, however, it is the 'quantity' which has taken preference over the 'quality', and 'adulteration' has often taken place, as for example in allowing 'untrained' graduates in mathematics and science to be recognised as qualified teachers. As Drake puts it, "Pressure of numbers has dominated official thinking. Where short-term teacher supply considerations have conflicted with what were thought to be important training considerations, the conflict has generally been resolved in favour of the former. Policy changes likely to affect the 'quality' of teaching, such as the introduction of compulsory training for graduates in schools, were for many years opposed on the grounds that they would aggravate the supposed shortage of teachers." (Drake, 1973:338).
3. With the reorganisation of Local Government in 1974 these Local Education Authority Associations became the 'Association of Metropolitan Authorities' (AMA), the 'Association of County Councils' (ACC), while the AEC was all but replaced by the 'Council of Local Education Authorities' (CLEA), with seven members drawn from each of the AMA and ACC. (Regan, 1977:28-31).
4. According to Rose, "Programmes are legal and organizational attempts to translate general policy intentions into specific government actions by allocating resources of money, personnel, laws and regulations." (Rose, 1981:17).

There were, of course, also many other factors besides the economic - such as political, social, and above all demographic - which were to influence the education, training and supply of teachers during the period under consideration in this thesis. The number of pupils entering and proceeding through the system is not within the control of policy makers. In the words of the House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure, "Roughly three quarters of the total educational expenditure is effectively pre-determined by the basic demographic factors of existing numbers and expected population growth and population movement, leaving only a quarter attributable to improvements of all kinds, the most important of which is the expected increase in the proportion choosing to remain within the education system after the age of compulsory schooling." (Select Committee on Expenditure, 1971).

5. The essential administrative machinery of the Public Expenditure Survey Committee (PESC) was set up in 1962, in parallel with a reorganisation of the Treasury itself. In a technical sense, the work of PESC is a limited one. It exists to prepare a document for Ministers in Cabinet showing how much it will cost to maintain presently intended policies over the forthcoming five year period. This task, however, carried the Treasury deeply into the work and policies of the spending Departments of State. (Westoby, 1979:22-23).

6. This is the conventional view that Ministers determine policy. According to William Pile, former Permanent Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, "Objectives, priorities and decisions are settled by Ministers, and not Civil Servants. Ministers expect Civil Servants to concentrate on means where ends have already been determined, and on options where ends remain to be determined." (Select Committee, 1976:11).

7. According to Lord Bridges, former Head of the Civil Service, "The constitutional responsibility of Ministers to Parliament and the public covers every action of the Department, whether done with their specific authority or by delegation, expressed

or implied. Ministers cannot, therefore, escape responsibility for administrative matters. They are, of course, more interested - and rightly so - in issues of policy than in detailed administration. But this does not mean that their Advisers have no part to play in framing policy. It is, indeed, precisely on these broad issues that it is the duty of a Civil Servant to give his/her Minister the fullest benefit of the storehouse of departmental experience, and to let the waves of the practical philosophy wash against ideas put forward by his/her ministerial master." (Bridges, 1950:19).

According to Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, "Some Ministers prefer to be left with an open choice; others welcome a recommendation from the Department as to which option should be adopted. You will see that, at this stage in the process, unless Ministers have laid down in advance, not only the general objective to be aimed at, but also the strategy to be followed, the initiative rests with his Officials. To that extent Officials may be said to devise, or make, policies." (Weaver, 1979:57).

Finally, in the words of Fenwick and McBride, "A policy change may stem from many sources - the campaign of lobby groups, the findings of research, the recommendations of major reports, the commitment of political parties, the personalities or predilections of different Ministers - but the advice of permanent Officials and the respect usually afforded to the informed opinion of the Department of Education and Science are likely, always, to be the major factors in the determination of policy." (Fenwick and McBride, 1981:33).

8. According to Toby Weaver, policy making involves:

- a) the refinement of objectives and problems;
- b) the intensive collection and analysis of information;
- c) the choice and design of strategy options;
- d) the judgement of probabilities;
- e) the assessment of consequences and costs;
- f) the testing of acceptability and practability; and
- g) the ordering of preferences.

9. In 1960, for example, the House of Commons contained 113 ex-teachers, 84 on the Labour Side, of whom 27 were, or had been, NUT sponsored members. (Coates, 1972:16).

10. For example, in 1973, following the publication of the White Paper - 'Education: a framework for expansion' - it was reported that leaders of the Teachers' Associations were threatening to turn a meeting with Margaret Thatcher, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, into a confrontation over allegations that she had not consulted them on decisions which could affect the future shape of the teaching profession. (Times Educational Supplement, 23 March 1973; and Guardian, 19 March 1973).

#### REFERENCES

- Bates, A W (1972), 'Reformation or Revolution? The relevance of the James Report to the state of education'. London Education Review, 1. 2, pp. 3-10.
- Blum, A A (1969), Teacher Unions and Associations. University of Illinois.
- Bridges, E (1950), Portrait of a Profession. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R G S (1970), The Administrative Process in Britain. Methuen.
- Coates, R D (1972), Teachers' Unions and Interest Group Politics. Cambridge University Press.
- DES (1966), Government of the Colleges of Education: Report of the Study Group under the chairmanship of T R Weaver. (Weaver Report). HMSO.
- DES (1967), Training of Teachers Regulations. HMSO. (Statutory Instrument 792).
- DES (1970), A Teaching Council for England and Wales: report of the Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science. (Weaver Report). HMSO.
- DES (1976), The Government's Reply to the Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee - 'Policy Making in the Department of

Education and Science.' HMSO. (Cmnd. 6678).

Drake, K (1973), 'The Scope for Economic Analysis', in: Lomax, D E (1973), *The Education of Teachers in Britain*. Wiley.

Education Act (1944): An Act to reform the law relating to education in England and Wales. HMSO.

Fenwick, K and McBride, P (1981), *The Government of Education*. Robertson.

Finer, S E (1966), *Anonymous Empire: a study of the lobby in Great Britain*. Pall Mall.

Fowler, G T (1979), 'The Accountability of Ministers', in: Lello, J (1979), *Accountability in Education*. Ward Lock.

Gladden, E N (1963), *Central Government Administration: a student's guide to public administration*.

Gladden, E N (1967), *Civil Services of the United Kingdom, 1853-1970*.

Gosden, P H J H (1966), *The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales*. Blackwell.

Hanson, A H and Waller, M (1970), *Governing Britain*. Fontana.

Hencke, D (1977), 'The Government and College Reorganisation'. *Higher Education Review*, 9. 3, pp. 7-18.

Hencke, D (1978), *Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77*. Penguin.

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1968), *Her Majesty's Inspectorate*. HMSO. (HC 400).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1969), *Student Relationships*. HMSO. (HC 449).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), *Teacher Training*. HMSO. (HC 182).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1971), *Governmental Financial Control and Budgeting in Education*. (Second Report). HMSO. (HC 545).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1972), *Further and Higher Education*. HMSO. (HC 48-1).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1976), *Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science*. (Tenth Report). HMSO. (HC 621).

House of Commons Select Committee on Procedure (1969), *Scrutiny of Public Expenditure and Administration*. HMSO. (HC 410).

Howell, D A and Brown, R (1983), *Educational Policy Making: an*

- analysis. Heinemann. (Studies in Education 12).
- Kimber, R and Richardson, J J (1974), Pressure Groups in Britain. Dent.
- Kogan, M (1971), The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan. Penguin.
- Kogan, M (1975), Educational Policy Making: a study of interest groups and Parliament. Allen & Unwin.
- Kogan, M and Packwood, T (1974), Advisory Councils and Committees in Education. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lello, J (1979), Accountability in Education. Ward Lock.
- Locke, M (1974), Power and Politics in the School System. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lomax, D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.
- Manzer, R A (1970), Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944. Manchester University Press.
- Morris, N (1969), 'England', in: Blum, A A (1969), Teachers' Unions and Associations. University of Illinois.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1975), Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales. OECD. (Reviews of National Policies for Education).
- Pile, W (1974), 'Corporate Planning for Education in the Department of Education and Science.' Public Administration, 52. 1, pp. 13-25.
- Political and Economic Planning (1960), Advisory Committees in British Government. Allen & Unwin.
- Regan, D E (1977), Local Government and Education. Allen & Unwin.
- Rose, R (1969), Policy Making in Britain: a reader in government. Macmillan.
- Rose, R (1981), The Growth of Government in the United Kingdom since 1945: a programme of research. Centre for the Study of Public Policy.
- Taylor, W (1973), Research Perspectives in Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Taylor, G and Saunders, J B (1976), The New Law of Education. Butterworths.
- Weaver, T R (1979), Department of Education and Science:



central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Westoby, A (1979), Finance for Education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 7).

Wheare, K C (1955), Government by Committee: an essay on the British Constitution. Oxford University Press.

Wilson, H (1971), The Labour Government, 1964-70: a personal record. Cape.

Chapter 4. THE ROBBINS COMMITTEE REPORT: A Policy for the Expansion of Teacher Education and Training.

During the latter part of the 1950s there arose a growing concern that the provision of higher education in England and Wales was becoming inadequate to keep pace with the increasing number of students in schools who, by gaining two 'A' Level passes, or the equivalent, were becoming 'qualified' to enter higher education. Demand was beginning to outstrip supply: higher education was not expanding as fast as the Sixth Forms in schools, which had themselves increased because of the 'bulge' - the larger number of children who had been born in the middle of, or just after the end of, the Second World War; and because of the 'trend' - the increase in the proportion of people of a given age who were achieving good qualifications, and who wanted to enter higher education, especially the Universities. In 1962, at the beginning of the decade in question, there were 216,000 students of advanced level standard beyond the age of eighteen - 118,000 in Universities, 43,000 in Colleges of Technology and other further education institutions, and 55,000 in Teacher Training Colleges. In short, 55% were in the 'autonomous sector' and 45% in the 'public sector' of higher education. (Weaver, 1973:5-6).

As a result of these developments, the proportion of young people with good qualifications, able to go on to University, fell from nearly 80% in 1956, to 65% in 1961. (Layard & King, 1968:18). The pressure felt by the schools, as a result of the failure of higher education to expand as rapidly as the Sixth

Forms, had been discussed by the Crowther Committee in 1959, but the Committee's terms of reference had excluded any investigation of, or inquiry into, higher education. (CAC, 1959, Crowther Report).

In addition to the increased demand for more places in higher education, the recent creation of the Colleges of Advanced Technology and the expansion of the Teacher Training Colleges had begun to alter the balance between the autonomous university sector and the public sector of higher education.(1) In the case of the former, a Government White Paper, 'Technical Education' - published in 1956, had introduced some system into the technical college field by designating a hierarchy of colleges, with ten 'Colleges of Technillogy' at the top. (Ministry of Education, 1956). This reform was continued by another Government White Paper, 'Better Opportunities in Technical Education' - published in 1961, which set out a policy for 'rationalising' courses between institutions. (Ministry of Education, 1961).

In the case of the Teacher Training Colleges, the emergency training scheme of 1945-51, aimed at making good post-war shortages and providing for the raising of the school leaving age to fifteen in 1947, had boosted teacher supply. In addition, between 1946 and 1948, seventeen new Local Education Authority Teacher Training Colleges had been opened, and student number had risen from 13,000 in 1947, to 21,500 in 1950, and to 24,000 in 1955. By the end of the 1950s the effect of the birthrate bulge of the immediate post-war years was

beginning to appear in schools, as was the trend for staying on into the Sixth Form and, with the lengthening of the Teacher Training College course from two to three years in 1960, this meant that the Teacher Training Colleges were becoming a very sizeable and important part of higher education in England and Wales.

Thus by 1961, when the Robbins Committee was appointed, the Teacher Training Colleges had already developed to a point at which they constituted a major segment of the higher education system. (DES, 1963, Report on Education). In 1900 Teacher Training Colleges had provided one fifth of all students in higher education: by 1960 this had risen to nearly one third, and the ninety Teacher Training Colleges in 1948 had risen to 146, while student numbers had doubled since 1957. (Robbins Report, 1963:15, Table 3). More important, more than one third of the students entering Teacher Training Colleges had obtained two or more 'A' Level passes - the minimum university entrance requirement. (Robbins Committee, 1963:111, Table 38). It was to the Colleges of Advanced Technology and the Teacher Training Colleges that the qualified school leavers, unable to enter a University, now went. As a result, this improved the quality of students in the public, non-university sector of higher education, and contributed to pressures for raising the status of these Colleges and the qualifications obtained in them.

During the 1950s, however, the Government had no concerted plan for higher education as a whole. The Universities remained separate from the rest of the higher education system, both

individually and collectively. They received their finance through the 'University Grants Committee' (UGC). The UGC reported to the Treasury and was not itself responsible, or directly accountable, to Parliament. This may have been reasonable enough in 1919, when the UGC had been created, without legislation, to advise the Treasury on how its grants to the Universities should be distributed, but as the size of the university grant grew, this arrangement became increasingly untenable, and politically unacceptable. As the Robbins Committee was later to put it: "It is only natural that the general direction of (university) development has come to be regarded as a matter of public interest." (Robbins Report, 1963:4). The sums of public expenditure involved were becoming so large that there had to be more coordination between the different sectors of higher education, and a definite 'rationale' to the whole process of development. (Kogan, 1975:196).

The rest of the higher education system in England and Wales - the public sector - was under the control of the Ministry of Education, but there was little coordination or control between the planning of the Teacher Training Colleges and the Colleges of Advanced Further Education. Teacher training and supply were planned, in relation to the country's need for teachers, on the advice of the 'National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST), the so-called 'manpower planning approach' which - as will be examined later in this thesis - left a great deal to be desired.(2)

Further education was not, in general, planned in any quantitative sense: "There never has been any uniform pattern of technical education throughout the country over the last sixty years. Technical Colleges had grown up in response to local demand and their siting had been largely dictated by the location of industry. (Ministry of Education, 1956). By the beginning of the 1960s there were, thus, very good political, social and economic reasons for setting up an inquiry into higher education as a whole. The stage was set for Robbins. (Kogan, 1975:195).

#### THE SETTING UP OF THE ROBBINS COMMITTEE.

The case for an inquiry into higher education was first argued in Parliament, on a motion put down by Lord Simon of Wythenshawe, on Wednesday 11 May 1960, when the latter rose to ask the Government to appoint a committee to inquire and report on the extent and nature of the provision of full time education for those over the age of eighteen, whether in Universities or in other educational institutions. (House of Lords, 1960, 223:616). The setting up of such 'Committees of Inquiry' - as this thesis has already examined - was the normal practice in the formation of policy in Government. However, the reasons for setting up this inquiry into higher education, as put forward by Lord Simon, are worth reproducing in full, since they obviously reflect the concern felt both inside, and outside, Parliament at this time - concern which is apparent in the 'terms of reference' actually given to the Higher Education Committee, and in its subsequent recommendations:

"In the last few years there has been a remarkable acceleration in the vigour and energy of the University Grants Committee, due to the fact that there is a great increase in the number of Sixth Forms, and of persons anxious to go to the Universities. Public opinion has been demanding that places should be available for all those willing to go, and Parliament looks like paying three quarters of the necessary funds. It seems to me likely that the numbers having doubled from 50,000 to 100,000 in the last twenty years, may double again in the next twenty years from 100,00 to 200,000 (in the Universities). Also, (in non-university institutions) there has been a remarkable growth in recent years. Today there are 30,000 people in Teacher Training Colleges, and 40,000 in Technical, Commercial and Art Colleges, that is 70,000 altogether, which is not so very far behind the 100,000 of the Universities. However, the contacts between the Colleges of Technology and the Universities are very slight." (House of Lords, 1960, 223:616).

According to Lord Simon, there were six matters - all mainly of an administrative nature - which urgently required examination by a national Committee of Inquiry:

- a) the probable rate of expansion over the next twenty years;
- b) the relationship between the administration of university and non-university educational institutions;
- c) some aspects of the work of the University Grants Committee;
- d) the best size, location and number of Universities, and

the need for responsibility;

e) the whole problem of university finance; and

f) the great need of learning from overseas Universities.

(House of Lords, 1960, 223:611).

This motion attracted support from all sides of the House of Lords, so much so that the Lord Privy Seal and Minister for Science, Viscount Hailsham, stated for the Government that it would look with favour upon such a Committee of Inquiry. (House of Lords, 1960:223, 730). He later repeated this statement during the 'Gulbenkian Educational Discussion' - held on 25 November 1960: "We have set up, or are about to set up, a Committee of Inquiry which will cover the whole of this issue, and it will be - I hope - a fairly high grade committee on which everybody will be represented. It will be a balanced inquiry into this very issue. I do think we intend to be guided by it." (Ford, 1960:132). Also, in the House of Commons, Sir David Eccles, Minister of Education, and the Minister responsible for higher education in the public sector, was known to be pressing for a similar inquiry. (Boyle, 1979:3).

There was some discussion, however, as to what form such an inquiry should take. None of the existing 'education committees' - the University Grants Committee, the Central Advisory Council for Education, the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers - would do: their scope, functions and powers were too limited and too circumscribed to conduct an inquiry into all aspects of higher education throughout the country. Only an 'ad hoc' committee of inquiry,



specially set up for the purpose, would be able to carry out the inquiry effectively. As a result some suggested a 'Royal Commission.' (House of Lords, 1960, 223:623). Others were less certain about a Royal Commission. (House of Lords, 1960, 223:643). The Government itself did not favour setting up a Royal Commission. (House of Lords, 1960, 223:726). In the end, a specially created 'Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education' was announced by the Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan, on 10 November 1960. The latter stated that the Committee's terms of reference would include the long-term development of the Universities, the Colleges of Technology, Colleges of Further Education and Teacher Training Colleges. (House of Commons, 1960, 632:1065). The Committee's full terms of reference would be as follows:

"To review the pattern of full time higher education in Great Britain, and in the light of national resources, to advise Her Majesty's Government on what principles its long term development should be based. In particular, to advise:

- a) whether there should be any changes in that pattern;
- b) whether any new types of institution are desirable;
- c) whether any modifications should be made in the present arrangements for planning and coordinating the various types of institution." (House of Commons, 1960, 632:1065).

On 20 December 1960, it was announced that the Chairman of the 'Committee of Inquiry on Higher Education' would be Lord Lionel Robbins, formerly Professor of Economics at the London School of Economics, and Chairman of the 'Financial Times.' Lord

Robbins was invited, in his own words, "To be Chairman of a Prime Minister's inquiry into the present state, and future prospects, of higher education in Great Britain." After some hesitation, he accepted. (Robbins, 1971:272).

The rest of the Higher Education Committee were not appointed until 8 February 1961. (House of Commons, 1961, 634:104). There were twelve members in all, including Lord Robbins. The latter had insisted on the Committee being small, and had succeeded, "In keeping it to a manageable size, instead of the usual unwieldy, slightly bogus, representation of all lobbies and interests, so beloved of the private offices of Ministers." (Robbins, 1971:274). There was some serious complaint that the Committee's membership did not include a representative from the Teacher Training Colleges, but the Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan, refused to alter or increase the membership. (Browne, 1979:110).

#### THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE ROBBINS COMMITTEE.

During the course of its deliberations, between February 1961 and October 1963, the Robbins Committee met at least once, and often twice, a week. In between meetings there were almost daily consultations with the Secretariat, or other experts, and frequent visits to institutions of education at home and abroad. (Robbins, 1971:274). The Robbins Committee held 111 meetings, received over four hundred written submissions of evidence from people and organisations, interviewed formally representatives of ninety organisations and thirty one

individual witnesses, as well as visiting Universities, Colleges of Advanced Technology, Technical and Training Colleges in Great Britain, and several countries abroad, notably France, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States and the Soviet Union. Most important of all, the Robbins Committee commissioned a number of major surveys and statistical inquiries to provide the factual and statistical evidence for their recommendations. (Robbins Report, 1963:1 & Annex:297-312). The Report of the Higher Education Committee, together with five volumes of Appendices, was ready for publication by October 1963.

Even while the Robbins Committee was still sitting, however, there had been several important developments in the training and supply of teachers. The length of the course in the Teacher Training Colleges had been extended from two to three years in September 1960. This had been done on the recommendation of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers in its Fifth Report. (NACTST, 1956). With this in view, a total of 24,000 additional places had been authorized in the Teacher Training Colleges between 1958 and 1960. Thus, during the academic years 1962-63, there were nearly 48,000 students in Teacher Training Colleges - twice as many as ten years earlier, and this number, together with those in University Departments of Education, meant that the total number of student teachers in training reached 50,000 for the first time. (DES, 1963:2).

In January 1963, the Minister of Education, Edward Boyle,

announced that the Government accepted the recommendation by NACTST, in its Seventh Report, that the student population in the Teacher Training Colleges should be built up to 80,000 by the academic year 1970-71. (NACTST, 1962). As Edward Boyle pointed out, "Here is part of the system of higher education where we have already embarked, well in advance of the Robbins Committee recommendations, on a really major expansion. We have decided to treble the student population in the Teacher Training Colleges from 28,000 to 80,000 over a period of twelve years." (House of Commons, 1963, 681:650). By the beginning of the academic year in which the Robbins Committee was to issue its Report there were already 54,000 students on courses of initial training in 146 Teacher Training Colleges, 98 controlled by Local Education Authorities, the other 48 by the Voluntary Bodies, together with 3,500 students in the twenty Departments of Education in the Universities. (Table 2).

#### THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ROBBINS COMMITTEE

The Higher Education Committee, under its Chairman Lord Robbins, submitted its Report to the Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan, on 23 September 1963, and it was published a month later, on 23 October 1963. The two guiding principles behind its recommendations were:

- a) that courses of higher education should be available for all those who were qualified by abilities and attainment to pursue them, and who wished to do so; and

b) that there should be equal academic awards for equal performance, i.e. that students outside Universities should be able to get degrees, not just degree level qualifications. (Robbins Report, 1963:paras.31 & 34).

To fulfill its first principle the Robbins Committee recommended a massive expansion in the number of students in higher education in England and Wales over a ten, and then over a twenty, year period. Compared with the 185,000 students in full-time higher education in England and Wales in 1962-63, the Robbins Committee recommended that places should be available for 335,000 in 1973-74, and for about 481,000 in 1980-81. A similar scale of expansion - although on the different principle of the manpower needs for qualified teachers - was recommended for the Teacher Training Colleges. Compared with the 49,000 students in Teacher Training Colleges in England and Wales in 1962-63, there should be about 111,000 in 1973-74, and about 131,000 in 1980-81. (Robbins Report, 1963:160, Table 44; & 136-143, Appendix I 4).

For its second principle, the Robbins Committee recommended the setting up of a 'Council for National Academic Awards' (CNAA). (Robbins Report, 1963:para.433). The new CNAA would be on the lines of the existing National Council for Technological Awards, but with wider terms of reference, and with the power to award degrees to students in public sector institutions of higher education.

In its Report the Robbins Committee paid considerable attention

to the training and supply of teachers. In particular, it made specific recommendations concerning the 'content' and 'control' of teacher training. The Robbins Committee fully acknowledged the important part now being played by the Teacher Training Colleges in the higher education system, but at the same time indicated some of the underlying discontent felt by the Colleges themselves: "The Teacher Training Colleges in England and Wales feel themselves to be only doubtfully recognised as part of the system of higher education, and yet have attained standards of work and a characteristic ethos that justify their claim to an appropriate place in it. The health of the whole public system of education depends upon the efficiency of the Training Colleges: the problem is to define their place in terms of the two aspects of their work - that of providing a general higher education for the increasing numbers of young people, and that of providing teachers well prepared to meet the changing needs of the schools." (Robbins Report, 1963:para.308).

The Robbins Committee believed this 'discontent' could be removed by improving the 'academic content' of the Teacher Training Colleges, and by altering their 'administrative control': "We must make it clear that, in our view, which is supported by much evidence, the current discontent in the Teacher Training Colleges is not just a matter of wanting degrees: it goes much deeper, and involves the whole standing of the Colleges in the system of higher education in this country. To the solution to this problem we believe the key is an appropriate closer association with the Universities,

without the loss of the links with the Local Education Authorities and the schools." (Robbins Report, 1963:para.360)

This 'university connection' was to be the crux of the Robbins Committee recommendations concerning the Teacher Training Colleges. As the Robbins Report put it, "Since the establishment of the university Institutes of Education, following the McNair Report of 1944, and more especially since the lengthening of the college course from two to three years, the Teacher Training Colleges in England and Wales have felt themselves closer to the Universities and desirous of coming more closely yet into the university orbit." (Robbins Report, 1963:para.312). Indeed, according to Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, the Robbins Committee had a paradigm in its mind of what an institution of higher education should be: the only institutions which conformed to this paradigm were the Universities. (Weaver, 1973:5).

#### The 'Content' of Teacher Training.

The Robbins Committee made specific recommendations concerning the 'academic content' of teacher training. First, it recommended that the Teacher Training Colleges in England and Wales should be renamed 'Colleges of Education' - as they were already called in Scotland. (Robbins Report, 1963:351). Second, while acknowledging the desire in some quarters for an 'all-graduate' teaching profession, the Robbins Committee recommended that the existing three year concurrent course

leading to a teachers' certificate should continue to be available. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.329). At the same time the Robbins Committee recommended that four year concurrent courses leading both to a degree and a professional qualification should be provided in Colleges of Education for suitable students. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.333). This new 'Bachelor of Education (BEd) degree' was to be a degree of the University with which the College of Education would be linked. (Robbins Report, 1963:paras.341 & 352). Such a BEd degree was also to be available by part-time study. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.340). In a similar vein, the Robbins Committee recommended that suitable students should be allowed to transfer, after a period at a College of Education, to a University to take a degree in the subject of their choice. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.338). The Robbins Committee also recommended that certain Colleges of Education should be given 'university status' - thereby providing 20,000 places in the university sector of higher education.

Finally, foreseeing a widening role for the Colleges of Education, the Robbins Committee recommended that Colleges of Education should increasingly provide for students whose intention was to take up a career other than teaching. (Robbins Committee, 1963:para.485). Where any new foundation was needed, experiments should be made in which further education and the education and training of teachers should be combined in a single institution. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.489). To reflect their more advanced academic courses and their widening role, the Robbins Committee recommended that the average size of a



Colleges of Education should be increased and, in the future, a College of Education with less than 750 students should be the exception. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.319).

#### The 'Control' of Teacher Training.

Under the pre-Robbins system of higher education, the Teacher Training Colleges were controlled by the Local Education Authorities and the Voluntary Bodies, administered by Institutes of Education, comprising a University Department of Education and several constituent Teacher Training Colleges. Such Institutes of Education acted as 'Area Training Organisations' (ATOs), whose purpose was to supervise and to secure the cooperation of establishments for the training of teachers within the area, to recommend students for acceptance by the Minister as qualified teachers, and to promote the study of education. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.203). The ATOs were responsible, under Teacher Training Regulations, to the Minister of Education, who was advised on major matters of policy affecting the training and supply of teachers by the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST). (Robbins Report, 1963:para.315). To this control structure the Robbins Committee recommended several major alterations.

First, the Robbins Committee recommended that each of the Colleges of Education in the existing Institutes of Education, together with the University Department of Education, should be merged into a 'School of Education'. (Robbins Report,

1963:para.351). It should be noted that the proposal for 'Schools of Education' made by the Robbins Committee closely resembled one originally put forward by the McNair Committee in 1944. One of the members of this latter Committee was Philip Morris who, as Sir Philip Morris, Vice Chancellor of the University of Bristol, was now a member of the Robbins Committee. The McNair proposal had, however, been rejected by the Government of the day. (Regan, 1977:142).

The governing bodies of the new Schools of Education, proposed by the Robbins Report, would have representatives on them drawn from the appropriate Local Education Authorities but, otherwise, the latter would lose all financial and administrative control. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.354). Those Colleges of Education controlled by the Voluntary Bodies would also be involved in the Schools of Education, subject to some modification in their financial arrangements. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.356). These governing bodies would have assessors appointed by the Minister of Education. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.354).

Since the Robbins Committee recommendation entailed the transfer of the Colleges of Education from the 'public' to the 'autonomous' sector of higher education, and since the Robbins Committee had also recommended that a single 'Higher Education Grants Commission' should be responsible for advising the Government on the needs of all autonomous institutions of higher education in Great Britain, and for distributing grants to them, the Robbins Committee also recommended that the same

Higher Education Grants Commission, through its Education Committee, should be responsible for the Schools of Education in England and Wales. (Robbins Report, 1963:paras.744 & 745). The Colleges of Education themselves were to be financed by ear-marked grants made by the Higher Education Grants Commission through the Universities to their Schools of Education. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.355). The Robbins Committee further recommended that the Higher Education Grants Commission should consist of a full-time Chairman, two full-time Deputy Chairmen, about twenty part-time members, and have a staff which should be responsible to the Higher Education Grants Commission itself, and be considerably larger than that of the existing University Grants Committee. (Robbins Report, 1963:paras.744 & 749). The Robbins Committee also recommended that the present arrangements under which the University Grants Committee was not accountable in detail to Parliament should be applied to the new Higher Education Grants Commission, and to all the institutions for which it was responsible. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.755).

The Higher Education Grants Commission recommended by the Robbins Committee would work through 'standing committees' - including two 'education committees' - one for England and Wales, and one for Scotland, to deal with areas of study; and through 'ad hoc' committees to deal with topics of current interest. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.745). The most pressing task, as the Robbins Committee saw it, was to devise improvements in the present system for the allocation of recurrent grants and to put them into effect as soon as

possible. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.751). In short, the Robbins Committee was recommending the removal of the administrative and financial control of the Colleges of Education from the hands of the public sector Local Education Authorities, and placing them under the control of the autonomous sector of the Universities - something which, as this thesis will examine - was politically unacceptable.(3)

The Robbins Committee also recommended that the national controlling body for the Colleges of Education, and for the other institutions of higher education, should be a new 'Ministry of Arts and Science', responsible through the Higher Education Grants Commission, for the Universities, the Colleges of Education and the Research Councils. The 'Minister for Arts and Science' would be advised by a plethora of 'Advisory Committees' - the new Higher Education Grants Commission and the Council for National Academic Awards, and the existing National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. (Robbins Report, 1963:paras.784, 797 & 799).

However, the Robbins Committee also recommended that a separate 'Ministry of Education' should be responsible - through the Local Education Authorities - for the schools, further education and advanced further education in the public sector. The 'Minister of Education' would be advised by the same Advisory Committees listed above, but with the addition of the Central Advisory Councils for Education in England and Wales. (Robbins Report, 1963:para.783). This would mean, in effect, that the responsibility for the training and supply of teachers

would be split between the two separate Ministries of Education. To this recommendation for two separate Ministries of Education, however, a 'Note of Reservation' was added by Harold Shearman, the only member of the Robbins Committee who had contemporary ties with the Local Education Authorities, having been Chairman of the London County Council Education Committee from 1955 to 1961, and Chairman of the LCC in 1961-62. In his view, a single Minister of Education, or Secretary of State, with one or two Ministers of State to assist him, was the more satisfactory answer. (Robbins Report, 1963:245). He foresaw that such a Minister or Secretary of State for Education would have increased political importance, and he felt very strongly that the future of the Colleges of Education lay in the public sector of higher education. As the Note of Reservation put it, "The effect of the recommendations taken together is that the Colleges of Education will have no immediate administrative contact with those who have major responsibility, central and local, for the schools. They know the need better than most, and they have a vital interest in the supply of teachers of suitable quality and in adequate numbers." (Robbins Report, 1963:294).

The Robbins Committee summed up its recommendations for the Colleges of Education as follows: "By the middle of the 1970s we expect that a substantial number of students will be taking four year courses leading both to a university degree and a professional qualification; and we hope that, long before that, the Colleges of Education in England and Wales will have been federated into university Schools of Education, financed by the

body responsible for university grants. These developments would ensure for the Colleges of Education a role in higher education even more important in the future than today." (Robbins Report, 1963:para.374).

This, thesis will examine later how, and why, these recommendations for the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education, training and supply were developed, continued and changed by subsequent government policy during the period from 1963 to 1973.

# THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ROBBINS REPORT.

Twenty four hours after the publication of the Robbins Report on 'Higher Education' the Conservative Government, now led by Sir Alec Douglas Home, 'responded' by welcoming the Report as, "An opportunity to set the course of higher education in this country for a generation." (Higher Education, 1963:1). First, the Government fully endorsed the two guiding principles of the Robbins Report, namely that:

a) courses of higher education should be available for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them, and who wish to do so; and

b) the establishment of a 'Council for National Academic Awards', which would administer degree courses for students in non-university institutions. (Higher Education, 1963:3). Second, the Government accepted the targets of the Robbins Report for student numbers up to 1973-74, and announced that funds would be made available for this purpose. (Higher Education, 1963:1). Finally, the Government accepted the further principle put forward in the Robbins Report that, "Autonomous institutions of higher education should draw the Government's financial support through an independent body on similar lines to the present University Grants Committee." (Higher Education, 1983:4).

Apart from these, however, and in spite of its apparently immediate acceptance of the Robbins Report, little or nothing was said in the Government's response about the training and

supply of teachers, either from the point of view of content or control: "The Government consider it would be wrong to announce decisions on such organisational matters before those most closely concerned have had an opportunity to express views on them in the light of the Report." (Higher Education, 1963:5). Hence, in November 1963, the Minister of Education, Edward Boyle, invited views on the arrangements recommended in the Robbins Report for the future training and supply of teachers in England and Wales. (DES, 1964:91).

Two issues, in particular, were to occupy the forefront of debate and controversy during the next few months. The first was the recommendation by the Robbins Committee that a new 'Ministry of Arts and Science should be established, through which a Higher Education Grants Commission should approach the Government on behalf of all autonomous university institutions. The second was the Robbins Committee recommendation that the Teacher Training Colleges should be removed from the control of the Local Education Authorities, and integrated administratively, as well as academically, into university 'Schools of Education'. Lord Robbins himself also regarded these two issues as "especially conspicuous." (Robbins, 1971:279).

In the case of the first issue, the matter was summed up by a speaker in a debate on the Queens Speech in the House of Commons, on 19 November 1963: "We have two proposals. There is that of the Robbins Committee for a Minister of Arts and Science, responsible for the complete and much enlarged range



of autonomous institutions, financed from the new Higher Education Grants Commission, and also absorbing the functions of the Minister of Science. Then, we have what one might call the 'Shearman system.' Mr Shearman made a minority recommendation that the whole system should be under one Minister, leaving the functions of the Minister for Science to be dealt with as a completely separate function." (House of Commons, 1963, 684:889).

There is some evidence that, at first, the Government was attracted to the recommendation that there should be a separate Minister for Arts and Science to take charge of the autonomous institutions of higher education, and the then Minister of Science, Lord Hailsham, was regarded as a likely candidate for such a post. (Times Educational Supplement, 25 October 1963). In November 1963, it was announced in the House of Commons that Lord Hailsham had been invited by the Prime Minister to become responsible for coordinating the work of the departments concerned with higher education. (Times Educational Supplement, 22 November 1963). Moreover, the Report of the Trend Committee, originally set up by Lord Hailsham to examine the organisation of civil science, which was published on 30 October 1963 - one week after the Robbins Report - also gave further support to the view that there should be a separate Minister in charge of both higher education and research. (Trend Committee, 1963).

On the other side, however, there is strong evidence that there were those in the Government, such as Lord Eccles, former Minister of Education, who thought that there was everything to

be said for creating and preserving a 'departmental unity' for education. Lord Eccles himself had for a long time been advocating one Minister in the Cabinet responsible for all education policy formation, assisted by two Ministers responsible for higher education and schools, and he continued to do so. (Times Educational Supplement, 22 November 1963; and 20 December 1963. Also, Education, 1 November 1963).

A similar view was held by Harold Wilson, Leader of the Opposition: "There is one subject with which I must deal, and that is the question of ministerial responsibility in science and education. There are two arguments going on - one Ministry, or two, in the field of education? I do not need to rehearse the arguments: they are familiar. I feel that the Government is making a mistake in looking at this issue from too narrow an angle, without bringing the questions of science and technology into it. In my view, the right answer to follow from this argument is the appointment of a 'Secretary of State for Education and Science', with a Minister of State for Schools, on the one hand, and a Minister of State for the Universities, operating through, and with, the University Grants Committee, on the other." (House of Commons, 1963, 684:827-830).

According to one report, this speech by Harold Wilson greatly pleased the ranks of former teachers and LEA supporters behind him. (Education, 2 November 1963). The Association of Education Committees (AEC) regarded this proposal as 'the kernel' of the whole Robbins Report. (Education, 25 October 1963). So strongly did the AEC feel about this issue that it immediately started a

campaign in favour of the 'Shearman proposal.' The Executive Committee of the AEC felt it right to urge the Prime Minister, in the strongest possible terms, that there should be one Minister of Education, not two, and a letter to this effect was sent by Sir William Alexander, the Secretary of the AEC, to the Prime Minister on the day following the Government's response to the Robbins Report. (Education, 1 November 1963).

This view in favour of one Minister of Education quickly found support among a wide variety of other education pressure groups. According to the NUT, the proposed ministerial arrangements for higher education seemed to be the least satisfactory aspect of the Robbins Report: "It is essential that education should be seen as a complete whole, and that no step should be taken which would lead to a division in the service, with the schools becoming the poor relations in the competition for adequate resources." (Education, 1 November 1963). The HMC also believed that the proposal for dual ministerial control would be against the best interests of the schools: "The processes of education at all levels are essentially a single undertaking, and it would be a denial of such fundamental unity to provide for the various elements in the educational system to be administered separately." (Education, 6 December 1963). Similarly, the AAM declared that the separation of higher education and education in schools between two separate Ministries of Education would weaken the links between the schools and the institutions of higher education. (Education, 13 December 1963). The HMA also supported the unitary solution. (Times Educational Supplement,

1 November 1963).

In the field of further education, the ATTI was also opposed to the proposal to divide the control of education between two Ministers, but for slightly different reasons: "We would emphasise that our support for this opinion implies a different conception of a Ministry of Education from that to which we have been accustomed. The division of control is particularly unfortunate since it implies that a number of Technical Colleges, Colleges of Art, and Colleges of Commerce, which are already taking a large amount of university level work, will continue to be regarded as institutions not concerned with higher education." (Education, 1 November 1963). More specifically, according to the AMA, the training and supply of teachers would be infinitely more difficult if higher education, particularly teacher training, were put under a Minister responsible for higher education alone. (Times Educational Supplement, 8 November 1963).

In short, all the major Teachers' Associations were in favour of the 'Shearman proposal' for one single Minister of Education. It was only in the field of higher education itself, as was to be expected, that the original Robbins Committee recommendation was whole-heartedly supported. According to the CVCP, it was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the CVCP that the recommendation of the Robbins Committee on this issue was right. (Education, 20 December 1963; and Times Educational Supplement, 8 November 1963). The AUT agreed with this view. (Education, 20 December 1963). The only dissenting

voice in the field of higher education was Lord James of Rusholme, Vice Chancellor of the University of York. (Boyle, 1979:13).

The views of the Local Education Authorities were summed up by the London County Council, of which Harold Shearman was himself a member: "We find the case for a single Minister of Education more convincing than the arguments for two Ministers. We regard the proposals for coordination and liaison as being made unnecessarily complicated by reason of the proposed division of administrative and ministerial responsibility. Under a single Minister the needs of all aspects of the educational system could be properly reviewed and coordinated, and the important relationship between the provision of further and higher education in Colleges of Education maintained or aided by Local Education Authorities, on the one hand, and the autonomous institutions financed by the University Grants Committee, on the other, more easily sustained and developed." (Education, 22 November 1963).

From the evidence available, there was little doubt that, by the end of 1963, the majority of the pressure groups in the education lobby supported one Minister of Education. In addition, the case of the Labour Opposition for a single Minister of Education was being continually voiced. For example, Richard Crossman, Shadow Minister for Science, speaking in Edinburgh in December 1963, declared that, by giving overall responsibility for the education system to a single Minister of Education, educational progress in the

critical decade ahead had the essential unity and direction of purpose. (Education, 20 December 1963). The Newsom Report must receive the same priority as the Robbins Report, under the same Minister of Education. (Crossman, 1963:602). According to Vig, the Labour Party was committed to a single Minister of Education because of its concern for lower and technical education, as well as the Universities: "The Newsom Report must not be neglected by the single-minded expansion of the Universities: secondary education was equally important. Educational planning must be brought together under a single Secretary of State for Education, with subordinate Ministers of State for schools and for universities. (Vig, 1968:96).

Evidence suggests that there was equally a change of heart in the Government. According to Boyle, the majority of Members of Parliament were in favour of one Minister, not two: the idea of a separate Department of Higher Education was out of the question. (Boyle, 1966:6). Moreover, the Treasury itself saw no reason why a single Minister of Education could not be responsible for all the educational priorities, and recommended that a 'Department of Education and Science' should be set up, under a single 'Secretary or State for Education and Science'. (Annan, 1967:241). In Boyle's words, "The Treasury itself strongly favoured the unitary solution, and I think that the advice of the Civil Service counted for more in the outcome than has always been realised." (Boyle, 1979:15). According to Herbert Andrew, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education, "The more we are driven to distinguishing between one level of education and another in our policy statements,

the more political difficulties we shall run into. We should always be in a position to define a balanced and coherent policy for the education of young people of all ages, all social classes and all classes of ability." (Boyle, 1979:13).

The Government's decision was finally announced by the Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas Home, following the normal convention, in the House of Commons, on 6 February 1964.(4) After taking full account of the views that had been expressed, the Prime Minister concluded that the right course was to have a single Minister with total responsibility over the whole system of education, who would be 'Secretary of State for Education and Science.' (House of Commons, 1964, 688:1339). The Prime Minister also revealed that the new Secretary of State for Education and Science would be Lord Hailsham, and that Edward Boyle, the present Minister of Education, would be one of the two Ministers of State for Education, with special responsibility for schools and certain establishments of further education. (House of Commons, 1964, 688:1340). Both were to have a seat in the Cabinet - a sign of the increased, and increasing, importance of the education portfolio. (Manzer, 1970:4).

From the evidence available, it is clear that the weight of opinion among the partisans and pressure groups in the formation of educational policy had carried the day in favour of the minority recommendation by Harold Shearman in the Robbins Report. The Government, in making its decision, had responded to the opposition to the idea of two separate

Ministers of Education and had, by its own admission, accepted the proposal originally put forward by Harold Wilson, Leader of the Opposition. (House of Commons, 1963, 703:1971). The reasons for the Government's change of policy, and its acceptance of the ideas of opposing pressure groups and partisans, are not hard to find: two out of the three partners in the 'educational sub-system, namely the Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations, were united in their opposition to the proposal for two separate Ministers of Education, while the third, the Minister of Education, was more than half convinced the other two were right. As Manzer puts it, "If a pressure group can convince the relevant Minister, ordinarily it has not much else to worry about." (Manzer, 1970:2). Moreover, with a General Election on the horizon, the Government could not afford to alienate large sections of the education lobby, whose support it might need.

There was, however, not to be the same consensus of opinion on the second of the recommendations made by the Robbins Committee, that Teacher Training Colleges should be integrated, both academically and administratively, into university Schools of Education - in many ways the most revolutionary of the recommendations of the Robbins Report. (Ford, 1964:152). On this issue the Teachers' Associations and the Local Education Authorities did not agree. Indeed, they took diametrically opposite views, reflecting the traditional conflict between the 'academic' and 'vocational' views of teacher education and training. (Regan, 1977:chapter 9).



The Teachers' Associations, as was to be expected, favoured closer links with the Universities, while the Local Education Authorities believed that teacher training and supply should remain firmly under public sector control. The issue of teacher supply, rather than teacher training, was the main reason put forward by the Local Education Authorities for continuing the existing arrangements.(5) As Sir William Alexander, Secretary of the AEC, put it: "This recommendation has resulted in a real difference of view. There are those who welcome the Robbins Committee recommendation and would favour its immediate implementation. There are those, on the other hand, who feel strongly that in the next few years the heavy burden - administratively and technically - in carrying out major building programmes to secure a sufficiently rapid expansion of the Teacher Training Colleges, to maintain a reasonable supply of teachers to the schools, makes it imperative that the existing administrative and financial relationship should continue, at least for a significant period of time. Indeed, they fear that an immediate implementation of the Robbins Committee recommendation could result in a complete breakdown of the school system because of a failure to secure an adequate supply of teachers." (Education, 14 February 1964). The combined view of the Local Education Authorities was sent by a letter to the Prime Minister on 23 December 1963. (Education, 31 January 1964).

The views of the Teachers' Associations were summed up by the ATCDE, which saw the recommendations of the Robbins Committee as the logical development since the McNair Report, and

believed that the importance of the close connection between Teacher Training Colleges and the Universities had been increased by the urgent necessity of giving students in Teacher Training Colleges the opportunity to take degrees. The ATCDE considered it impossible to separate the academic from the administrative and financial aspects of the Teacher Training Colleges. It, therefore, welcomed the proposed policy of administering and financing the Colleges by a Higher Education Grants Commission, acting through the Schools of Education. (Education, 29 November 1963; and 13 January 1964). This view was supported by the ATTI, NAS and NUT.

As the year 1964 progressed, however, it became clear that the threat of an impending General Election would make the Government postpone its decision on the recommendation of the Robbins Committee that Teacher Training Colleges should be integrated into university Schools of Education: "It seems generally agreed that we can expect no government decision on our affairs until those, who will have to make it, can feel relieved for a time from the worry about its possible effect on this or that section of the electorate. From waiting for Robbins we progress to waiting for the Election." (Education for Teaching, 1964, 64:2).

However, in the General Election of 1964, the Conservative Government was defeated, and a Labour Government came to power, with Harold Wilson as Prime Minister - an office he was to hold until June 1970. A Conservative Government had committed itself to the targets of the Robbins Report for student numbers: this

Government was not in power when policy was turned into practice. With the change in Government came a very discernible and obvious change in policy - a policy which was to lead to the separate development of higher education, and which was to have important consequences on policies for the training and supply of teachers.

## Chapter 4. NOTES AND REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. As the Robbins Report was to put it: "Much of the work done in certain technical colleges and colleges for the education and training of teachers has risen to university, or near university, level. The establishment of the Colleges of Advanced Technology and the lengthening of the course in the Training Colleges, combined with rising standards of entry, mean that Universities are no longer the sole providers of full-time higher education at degree level." (Robbins Report, 1963:4).

2. According to Hencke, "During the mid-1950s and early 1960s manpower planning policies for teachers failed to work. In 1956 it seriously under-estimated the demand for teachers in the next decade by failing to monitor birth-rate changes, and caused an unprecedented teacher shortage. In 1964, when it belatedly implemented a massive expansion of teacher training to meet the shortage of teachers, it over-estimated demand and ignored the start of a continual, and later a substantial, decline in the birth rate, resulting in the enormous unemployment of teachers today." (Hencke, 1978:9).

3. According to Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, the Robbins Committee's plan for higher education, when completed by 1980, would have meant that 88 per cent of all full-time students in higher education would have been in 'autonomous sector' institutions, and only 12 per cent in the 'public sector'. (Weaver, 1973:6).

According to Hencke, integration of the Teacher Training Colleges into 'Schools of Education' was to be rejected by the Government on two counts: it was thought to encourage a concentration of new colleges in university towns and cities, since any expansion in a university School of Education was likely to be near the University. Universities were also

thought to be remote from facilities for practical training in the schools, particularly in rural areas and country towns. (Hencke, 1978:25).

According to Regan, Local Education Authority public sector control of institutions of teacher education and training was convenient for the Government. If they were all incorporated into the autonomous university sector, and achieved the status and prestige of Universities, they would be far less amenable to government pressure. (Regan, 1977:163). As Willey and Maddison put it, "While the Colleges lack autonomy, the Universities lack control." (Willey & Maddison, 1971:83).

4. As Kogan puts it, "Major issues, whether there should be one or two Ministers of Education, are reserved to the Prime Minister because of the convention that the Cabinet has no concern with ministerial appointments. S/he can thus not only appoint and dismiss, but also shape areas of responsibility." (Kogan, 1971:35).

5. According to Drake, this concern with 'quantity' rather than 'quality' was a marked feature of both the DES and LEAs. (Drake, 1973:388). As Willey and Maddison put it, "The Department of Education and Science has concentrated on a policy, aided and abetted by the Local Education Authorities, that has emphasised the quantitative demands of the service at the expense of the qualitative nature of much of the training. (Willey & Maddison, 1971:14).

#### REFERENCES

Annan, N (1967), 'The Reform of Higher Education'. Political Quarterly, 38, pp. 234-252.

Boyle, E (1966), 'Parliament and University Policy'. Minerva 5. 1, pp. 3-19.

Boyle, E (1979), Government, Parliament and the Robbins Report. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).

Browne, J D (1979), Teachers of Teachers: a history of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of

Education. Hodder & Stoughton.

CAC (1959), 15 to 18: An enquiry into the education of boys and girls between 15 and 18 in relation to the needs of society and the individual. (Crowther Report). HMSO.

CAC (1963), Half Our Future. (Newsom Report). HMSO.

Committee of Inquiry into the Organization of Civil Science (1963), The Organisation of Civil Science. (Trend Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2171).

Committee on Higher Education (1963), Higher Education: a report of the committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the 'chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-63. (Robbins Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2154).

Crossman, R H S (1963), 'Robbins, Hailsham and Newsom'. New Statesman, 1 November 1963.

DES (1963), Education and Science in 1963: a report of the Department of Education and Science. HMSO.

Drake, K (1973), 'The Scope for Economic Analysis', in: Lomax D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.

Ford, B (1960), 'New and Larger Universities'. (Gulbenkian Educational Discussion). Universities Quarterly, 15. 2, pp.124-138.

Ford, B (1964), 'Second thoughts on Robbins'. Universities Quarterly, 18. 1, pp.119-168.

Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.

HM Government (1963), Higher Education: Government Statement on the Report of the Committee under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins. HMSO. (Cmd. 2165).

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1963), Higher Education. Hansard, 681:544.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1963), Science and Education. Hansard, 684:809.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1964), Education and Civil Science: ministerial responsibility. Hansard, 688:1339.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1964), Teacher Training Colleges: Report. Hansard, 703:1971.

House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1960), University and Other Higher Education. Hansard, 223:615-732.

House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1963), Higher Education.

Kogan, M (1971), *The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan*. Penguin.

Kogan, M (1975), *Educational Policy Making: a study of interest groups and Parliament*. Allen & Unwin.

Layard, R, King, J and Moser, C (1968), *The Impact of Robbins: expansion in higher education*. Penguin.

Lomax, D E (1973), *The Education of Teachers in Britain*. Wiley.

Manzer, R A (1970), *Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944*. Manchester University Press.

Ministry of Education (1956), *Technical Education*. HMSO. (Cmd. 9703).

Ministry of Education (1961), *Better Opportunities in Technical Education*. HMSO.

NACTST (1956), *Three Year Training for Teachers*. (Fifth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1962), *The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1960-80*. (Seventh Report). HMSO.

Regan, D E (1977), *Local Government and Education*. Allen & Unwin.

Robbins, L (1971), *Autobiography of an Economist*. Macmillan.

Vig, N J (1968), *Science and Technology in British Politics*. Pergamon.

Weaver, T (1973), *Higher Education and the Polytechnics*. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).

Willey, F T and Maddison, R E (1971), *An Inquiry into Teacher Training*. University of London Press.

## CHAPTER 5. THE BINARY POLICY: A Policy for the Separate Development of Higher Education.

The first Secretary of State for Education and Science in the new Labour Government was Michael Stewart, a former party spokesman on education. On 11 December 1964, he made a ministerial statement in the House of Commons, setting out the Government's policy for the 'training' of teachers. (House of Commons, 1964, 703:1971). The issue of 'supply' was left until later.

The Government accepted the recommendations of the Robbins Report on the 'content' of teacher training by agreeing that Teacher Training Colleges should be renamed 'Colleges of Education', and that BEd degrees should be made available for suitable students by means of four year courses. However, although the statement went on to say that the Government thought it would be appropriate for the relationship between the Universities and the Colleges of Education, already existing, to be further extended in the academic field through the development of the Institutes of Education, the Government did not accept the recommendation of the Robbins Report for the 'control' of teacher training. (House of Commons, 1964, 703:1972).

The recommendation of the Robbins Report had been that the Colleges of Education should be given independent governing bodies, and administered and financed by the Universities through 'Schools of Education' - with which the Colleges of



Education would be federated. The Government decided against an arrangement on these lines. Instead, it decided that, for the present, the Colleges of Education should continue to be administered by the existing bodies under the existing system of overall supervision.<sup>(1)</sup> The Government did, however, hold out the promise of greater internal self-government for the Colleges of Education. This promise later resulted in the setting up of the 'Weaver Committee.' (DES, 1966, Weaver Report).

According to Michael Stewart, the Government - in reaching its decision - had taken into account the views expressed on this issue since the publication of the Robbins Report by the various pressure groups, but that - after considering the advice given by the University Grants Committee - had concluded that the academic and administrative aspects were separable, and that fundamental changes should not be made in the administrative and financial structure of the teacher training system, particularly at a time when the Colleges of Education were engaged in a very large and rapid expansion, and when problems of 'teacher supply' were especially difficult. (House of Commons, 1964, 703:1972).

There is little doubt that there were critical problems in the supply of teachers at this time - as this thesis will examine below - but there is also strong evidence to suggest that it was pressure from the Local Education Authorities to retain control of the Colleges of Education which led the Government to make its decision. If the recommendation of the Robbins

Report had been accepted , the Local Education Authorities would have lost the majority of their full-time advanced students. This, and the desire of the Government to retain control over teacher supply, combined to maintain the 'status quo.' As Lord Annan put it: "If the autonomous sector meant a sector beyond even the influence, let alone the control, of the Department of Education and Science, the Secretary of State could look forward to a future in which virtually all the large scale institutions of higher education would pass out of his/her orbit and into that of the University Grants Committee. S/he was being asked to abdicate such power as s/he had to individual Universities, and over regional Technical Colleges to the University Grants Committee, which had only the most tenuous links with industry. Under such a policy the Chairman of the UGC would soon become a Minister in his own right, not accountable to Parliament, and only vestigally to the Department of Education and Science." (Annan,1976:241). Thus, the buffer between the Department of Education and Science and the Colleges of Education was to continue to be the Local Education Authorities. Hence, there was now little need for the 'Higher Education Grants Commission' recommended by the Robbins Report.

There is strong evidence, however, to suggest that the Government's statement on the control of the Colleges of Education had a much wider, and more far reaching significance. As Matterson puts it: "Those who knew the non-university sector well, notably the Civil Servants in the Department of Education and Science, were uneasily aware that the Robbins solution

would compel the higher reaches of the public education system into the university pattern through absorption into Universities, or through aspiration to the university league. The example of the Colleges of Advanced Technology showed that this could damage both high level and part-time education, and advanced education below degree level. There were also practical and political problems. The LEA colleges were part of a further education sector devoted to the concept of progressive education from course to course, and sometimes from college to college: the summit of this system did not lie naturally within the university sector. Nor would the LEAs take kindly to a massive transfer of their leading colleges into the university system. Ministers were also aware that transfer would entail a reduction in central control over the institutions. They came to think of other possibilities. The most obvious one, consonant with Robbins principles, was that of a deliberate 'development of the non-university system' in parallel with the Universities." (Matterson, 1981:10).

Sir William Alexander, Secretary of the AEC, summed up the way things were going as early as December 1964: "The decision now made makes available the 'alternative system of higher education' - which clearly not only includes Colleges of Education, as they will now be called, concerned with training teachers, it also includes the wide range of Technical, Commercial, Art and other Colleges which are offering opportunities for higher education over a very wide range of subjects."

It was only months after this statement that Antony Crosland, who by this time had succeeded Michael Stewart as Secretary of State for Education and Science, made the first public statement, in a speech at Woolwich Polytechnic on 27 April 1965, of the Government's new policy - a policy which implied that the divorce between the Universities and the rest of higher education was to be regarded as permanent: "On the one hand, we have what has come to be called the 'autonomous sector' - represented by the Universities, in whose ranks, of course, I include the Colleges of Advanced Technology. On the other hand, we have the 'public sector' - represented by the leading Technical Colleges and the Colleges of Education. The Government accepts this 'dual system' as being fundamentally the right one, with each sector making its own distinctive contribution to the whole. We infinitely prefer it to the concept of a unitary system hierarchically arranged on the 'ladder principle' - with the Universities at the top and the other institutions down below. The university sector will continue to make its own unique and marvellous contribution. We want the public sector to make its own equally distinguished, but separate, contribution." (2)

A full scale statement of Government policy came in the following year, in April 1966, when the Government published a White Paper, 'Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges'. (DES, 1966). This White Paper announced the Government's policy to designate up to thirty institutions as 'Polytechnics' formed from Regional Colleges of Technology, Colleges of Art and Colleges of Commerce, which would become the focal points of

development in higher education within the public sector. (DES, 1966:para.11). It was also made clear from the beginning that the Polytechnics would be equal in prestige to the Universities, but would not become autonomous: they would remain within the public sector of higher education. (DES, 1966:para.28).

The policy set out in the 1966 White Paper entailed the amalgamation of Colleges of Technology, Commerce and Art and, in two cases, Colleges of Education to form a new 'Polytechnic'. The latter, to be followed within five out of the thirty Polytechnics, was to be of great significance for the future development of Colleges of Education. As Hencke puts it: "They were the first institutions, outside the Universities, not to follow the slavish isolation of the teacher training profession. Even though most were not integrated thoroughly into the Polytechnics, the academic and administrative possibilities of ending the isolation and mono-technic nature of teacher training were enormous." (Hencke, 1978:31).

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BINARY POLICY.

The reasons which lay behind the 'binary policy' are too complex, concerned as they are with political, social and economic aspects, for them to be dealt with in great detail in this thesis, but some account is necessary if later developments in the training of teachers are to be understood.(3) Moreover, the evolution of the binary policy is a good example of the process of educational policy formation, since it involved the interaction of the various authorities and partisans within, and outside, the education sub-system of government. As the White Paper itself put it: "It is now necessary, in the light of these developments, to review the existing pattern of provision of higher education in the further education system of England and Wales. This the Government have done in consultation with the national bodies representing the Local Education Authorities and the teachers in Technical Colleges, and with the National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce, and the Council for National Academic Awards. Valuable help has been received from an informal Advisory Group under the chairmanship of the then joint Minister of State for Education and Science, Reg Prentice MP, consisting of individuals with experience of further education and industry. The Government now propose a further evolution of the present pattern on the lines outlined in this White Paper." (DES, 1966:para.2).

By its 'binary policy' the Government was departing significantly from the recommendation of the Robbins Committee

by deciding that there should be a large scale expansion of higher education outside the Universities - in the Colleges of Education and the major Technical Colleges. It will be remembered that the Robbins Committee had recommended the absorption of some Regional Colleges into Universities, with a period of direct grant from central Government as a transitional phase. Other Colleges would undertake first degree work but, as long as they remained outside the university sector, any of their students wishing to undertake postgraduate work should transfer to a University. The philosophy of this recommendation was that outside the circle of the Universities existed a hierarchy of institutions: promotion within the hierarchy depended upon the closer approximation - in the institutional style and in the level and type of work, to the university ideal, and the ultimate prize was the grant of a Royal Charter - what Burgess calls 'academic drift'. (Burgess, 1978:26).

The Robbins Report itself, however, may have unwittingly been responsible for the origins of the binary policy - by recommending the setting up of a 'Council for National Academic Awards', which could now be used to validate degrees and postgraduate awards, across the whole spectrum of academic disciplines, in Colleges in the public sector of higher education. (Boyle, 1966:7; and Niblett, 1975:229 & 221).

On the political side, there is strong evidence to suggest that Michael Stewart, when he became Secretary of State for Education and Science, was prepared to implement the

recommendation of the Robbins Committee for the Colleges of Education but that, when he discussed his proposed policy with his Civil Servants, including Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science responsible for further and higher education, he decided against it. (Robinson, 1968:26). Instead, his successor, Antony Crosland, accepted the recently formed departmental policy of creating a binary system of higher education - a policy designed to develop the public sector comparable with the university sector in the quality of its work and in the status it enjoyed, but under a radically different system of external control and financing.

Although Antony Crosland was the first to announce it publicly, the binary policy had part of its origins within the Department of Education and Science. Indeed, the evidence suggests that it had been departmental policy for some time, since Antony Crosland later criticised the Civil Servants at the DES for forcing the choice upon him before he was ready: "They wanted to get the policy on the record as soon as possible". (Kogan, 1971:193). A fact confirmed by Toby Weaver who, as Deputy (Under) Secretary at the DES, was responsible for advising Ministers of both Conservative and Labour Governments on the policy to be adopted following the recommendations of the Robbins Committee. (Weaver, 1973:8).(4)

Moreover, there is strong evidence to suggest that the Labour Party itself, while in Opposition, had come to favour the separate development of the public sector of higher education,



in spite of the recommendations of the Taylor Committee to create a large and un-differentiated system of higher education. (Taylor Report, 1963). The Taylor Committee had recommended a five year crash programme of university expansion, and the eventual inclusion of much of further education into the university sector. The whole of higher education was to be coordinated by a detailed 'National Plan' - under a 'National University Development Committee', which would replace the University Grants Committee. According to Vig, this proposal was rejected by the Labour Party Science Group, chaired by Richard Crossman, which preferred to give more attention to the the lower education sector. (Vig, 1968:89).

At the same time as the Robbins Report was being published, Harold Wilson, the then Leader of the Opposition, was addressing the Labour Party Conference in Scarborough, in a speech made as part of the debate on a policy statement, entitled 'Labour and the Scientific Revolution'. In this speech Harold Wilson saw the expansion of higher education in terms, not only of the wider spread of educational opportunity, but also of the new industrial demands being forged "in the white hot heat of the scientific revolution." The Universities and Colleges, Industry and Government must change their attitudes and their organisation if Britain was to educate, keep and utilize properly the scientists and technologists whose work would lay the foundation of national and international prosperity. (Labour Party, 1963). The effects of such beliefs can easily be traced in the Labour Government's policy for

higher education in the opening years of its period of power.

Thus, from the evidence available, the binary policy was formed, both within the Labour Party and within the Department of Education and Science, during the eighteen months between the publication of the Robbins Report in October 1963 and the first public announcement of the policy by Antony Crosland, as Secretary of State for Education and Science, in April 1965. Such a policy - for the 'separate development of higher education' - did not exist prior to this time, since both the Conservative and succeeding Labour Government accepted the bulk of the recommendations of the Robbins Committee, including the grant of university status to the Colleges of Advanced Technology. In 1962 the CATs had been taken out of the public sector, controlled by the Local Education Authorities, and made dependent on a direct grant from central Government: the change of name and status was therefore inevitable. (Fowler, 1972:270). If there had been a longer term policy for the development of the public sector of higher education - alternative to that found in the university sector, neither the 1962 transfer of the Colleges of Advanced Technology, nor the acceptance of the recommendation of the Robbins Committee for the CATs could have taken place: the transfer of the Colleges of Advanced Technology removed the top of the higher education system in the public sector.

Thus, the decision to transfer the Colleges of Advanced Technology to the university sector was in line with the philosophy which led to the foundation of seven new

Universities in the early 1960s - but it was a direct denial of the philosophy which had led to the creation of the CATs in the first place in the late 1950s. That philosophy - part of the tradition of 'education for investment' - was revived at exactly the same moment as the Colleges of Advanced Technology became Universities. (Kogan, 1971:123). According to this 'education for investment' tradition, the development of the Polytechnics was caused, in part, by the belief that Britain was failing to plan adequately for the supply of certain types of qualified manpower and that, consequently, the inadequacy of Britain's economic and industrial performance - when compared to that of other advanced industrial countries - could be explained partly by the shortage of technically qualified manpower, and by the dominance of the generalist tradition in higher education. All of which led the Government to devise new ways of producing practically orientated scientists and technologists. For example, the Labour Government's 'National Plan', published in September 1965, recognised "the cardinal role of education in securing increased productivity and economic recovery." (National Plan, 1965).

Linked with this was the belief that the Universities were divorced from real life. In particular, according to Richard Crossman, Shadow Minister of Science, addressing the Labour Party's Standing Conference on Science in Edinburgh, in December 1963, there was a divorce between the science of the Universities and the technology required if British industry were to expand. (Education, 20 December 1963). The creation of the Polytechnics would rectify this: "As mixed communities of

full and part-time teachers and students, they will - as a whole - have closer and more direct links with industry, commerce and the professions." (DES, 1966:para.4).

Besides the concept of economic investment was the concept of 'economic efficiency'. The creation of the Polytechnics was caused to a large extent by the need to make a more efficient use of scarce economic and educational resources. As a DES Report put it later on: "It was clear that some further measure of rationalization would be necessary, on grounds of both economy and efficiency, if the full-time higher education sector of the further education system was to be developed on sound lines. Rationalization was needed to ensure, not only that scarce resources of accommodation, equipment and staff were used to the best advantage, but also that proper provision was made for the needs of students following lower level courses. (DES, 1970:1).

Indeed, in no other policy statement on higher education up until this time had the words 'economic resources' been used so often. As the 1966 White paper put it: "The purpose of this policy is to give the Local Education Authorities and the Colleges concerned a firm foundation for the development of the designated Colleges, and to guide individual Local Education Authorities, the Regional Advisory Councils and the Department of Education and Science in the allocation of resources." (DES, 1966:para.14). According to the 1966 White Paper, the decision to develop and expand higher education within the public sector necessitated a 'review' of the existing provision, with the

object of using the available resources to the maximum efficiency in order to build up a strong and distinctive public sector of higher education which would be complementary to the Universities and the Colleges of Education. (DES, 1966:para.28).

Finally, and most important of all, for the first time the growth in 'student numbers' begins to be queried, if not questioned. Not only were advanced courses in further education proliferating in large numbers in a wide range of Colleges, but the number of students was increasing in proportion. According to the National Plan, published in 1965, there would be over 70,000 full time students following advanced courses in institutions of further education in 1969-70, compared with the estimate of the Robbins Report of 51,000 by 1973-74. (National Plan, 1965:para.23).

Moreover, the recent Pilkington Report on 'The Size of Classes and Approval of Further Education Courses' had drawn attention to the need for the further rationalization of courses in Technical Colleges in the interests of the most effective use of resources. (Pilkington Report, 1965). This aspect of the binary policy - the desire to make the most effective and efficient use of resources in view of the increasing demand for higher education - was to reach its culmination in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'. As Burgess puts it: "The White Paper of 1972 - which in its own words concentrated on matters of 'scale, organisation and cost' - rather than on the content of education, reflected in every one of its proposals the unstated triumph of the Crosland policy."

(Burgess, 1978:31).

According to Williams, one immediate effect of the binary policy was to bring the higher education system in the public sector more closely under Government control, by concentrating expansion in the newly designated Polytechnics. Until now, control over the provision of advanced further education was almost entirely a Local Education Authority responsibility: most of the finance came out of a 'pool' into which all Local Education Authorities paid, according to formulae based on local population and non-domestic rateable value, but they could draw out of the pool on the basis of the number of student places they provided. Thus, the Local Education Authorities who wished to expand their higher education provision could do so at very little cost to themselves, and the Government had virtually no control over their expenditure. By the terms of the binary policy the public sector was brought under Government control in a manner politically acceptable to the LEAs, which - unlike the Universities - do have a political power base independent of the Government. (Williams, 1973:13).

From the evidence listed above, the decision of the Labour Government to keep the Colleges of Education within the public sector of higher education may be seen as part and parcel of the binary policy. The LEAs were responsible for the schools, and had started to build up many institutions of higher education, including Colleges of Education, and it was believed - both by Government and LEAs - that they should maintain a reasonable role in higher education. As the White Paper put it:

"By their foresight and vigour in recent years they have expanded provision in anticipation of the growing demand and simultaneously improved standards. This has set a firm foundation on which to build for the future". (DES, 1966:para.5). Moreover, it was claimed by Antony Crosland, Secretary of State for Education and Science, speaking at Lancaster University on 20 January 1967, that the impending need to expand 'teacher supply' would not have been possible, if the Colleges of Education had not been under public sector control: "We thought it unwise to change horses in the middle of a turbulent stream of expansion, especially at a moment when the Universities themselves were also in the middle of very rapid change and development".

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE TRAINING AND SUPPLY OF  
TEACHERS.

The 1944 Education Act placed upon the Minister of Education the over-all responsibility for the provision of education to all children of school age and, consequently, the duty of ensuring that there would be an adequate supply of teachers for such children. In the early 1960s the issue of teacher supply was becoming critical, with over 7,000,000 children in schools, and a further 1,000,000 forecast by 1970. As a result, there was an urgent need for long-term and short-term policies to meet the increasing demand. Even before the publication of the Robbins Report, the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST) had recommended a target of 80,000 students in Teacher Training Colleges by 1971, and this figure had been accepted by the Conservative Government in January 1963. The Robbins Committee itself had considered making a recommendation to raise the target of 80,000, but had been told by the Ministry of Education that, because of the constraints of buildings, staff and the adaptive capacity of the Teacher Training Colleges, it would be impossible to increase this figure in any year before 1969. However, the Robbins Committee recommended that from this year onwards there should be a steep increase to 111,000 student places by 1973-74. (Layard and King, 1968:65).

On 24 February 1965 Antony Crosland, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, announced in a ministerial statement in the House of Commons that the 111,000 student places in Teacher



Training Colleges would indeed be available by 1973, thus nearly doubling the number of student teacher places within eight years. (House of Commons, 1965, 707:390-392). The monetary outlay on the training and supply of teachers would rise from 5.6 million pounds in 1955 to about 23.1 million pounds in 1965, in real terms from 4.2 million pounds to about 11.0 million. (Vaizey and Sheehan, 1968:93). In the same ministerial statement, it was also announced that the Government was urgently examining all possible ways of increasing the output of teachers from existing facilities. The '80,000 place programme' of 1963 had already made necessary the adoption of a number of emergency measures to increase teacher supply, including the overcrowding of existing Teacher Training Colleges, the retention of plant even after replacement buildings were ready, and the opening of six emergency 'Day Colleges'.

In April 1965, while addressing the Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, Antony Crosland set out a further 'fourteen point programme' of short-term policies to alleviate the problems of teacher supply. (Education, 23 April 1965). The most important fact about this fourteen point programme was not that it contained anything that was radical or new - many of the proposals had been discussed before - but that the Secretary of State for Education and Science was bringing to the problem some 'high frequency policy waves' in order to deal with an issue which seemed to him critical. As Kogan puts it: "None of the fourteen points were new in themselves. But the decision to have a fourteen point plan and give it top

priority, and generally to dramatize the situation, produced a new sense of urgency. I did not invent any of the fourteen points, but perhaps I increased the impetus. The distinctive contribution of the Secretary of State for Education and Science was to decide to push them forward, and take them to the firing point." (Kogan, 1971:192).

Equally important, Antony Crosland was anticipating the forthcoming Report of the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST), which was to show even more clearly than the forecasts of the Robbins Report the gravity of the teacher supply situation. This, the Ninth Report of NACTST, called for the acceleration of the recommendation of the Robbins Committee that there should be 40,000 students entering the Colleges of Education from 1971. The recommendations of the Ninth Report echoed many of the fourteen points put forward by Antony Crosland: "We therefore recommend that the Government should attempt, by all measures in their power, to bring the intake of 40,000 students in Colleges of Education still further forward. These measures should include the urgent and energetic prosecution of the existing plans and of our new proposals: the use of new building techniques to secure earlier completion of major projects, the acquisition and use of existing buildings in their own right, the expansion of existing Colleges, often only involving minor building work, such as the provision of cloak-rooms, dining rooms, lecture rooms and the like, to enable them to increase their student numbers and, with the consent of the Area Training Organisations, the use of Colleges of Further Education for

teacher training, if necessary, in collaboration with the Colleges of Education." (NACTST, 1965:75).

Following the publication of the Ninth Report of NACTST, in June 1965, Antony Crosland wrote to the Colleges of Education, asking them to prepare plans for using their buildings, already existing and planned, to house 20% more students than originally envisaged. This would increase the intake into Colleges of Education by 1968-69 to 35,000 compared with the planned intake of 29,000. The letter stressed that the needs of the schools demanded that advantage be taken of every means of increasing 'quantity' which was consistent with 'quality'. (DES, 1965, College Letter 7/65).

In spite of the apparent consensus on remedies for the teacher supply situation, the evidence strongly suggests that the Department of Education and Science, in general, and the Secretary of State for Education and Science, in particular, had come to believe that there was little real value in having an 'Advisory Committee' - such as the 'National Advisory Committee on the Training and Supply of Teachers' - and the Ninth Report of NACTST was to be its last. The reasons for this may be described as 'political' and 'technical'.

On the technical side NACTST had made some grave errors in forecasting the 'demand' and 'supply' of teachers in England and Wales. Such forecasts are necessary, of course, because what is done now will have its effects only in ten to fifteen years time, but the longer the time span, the greater the risk of inaccuracy. (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:312). As Ahamad points out, the main criticism which can be made of the work of NACTST is not that its forecasts of teacher supply were inaccurate, but that they gave the impression that they were accurate, rather than emphasizing that they were subject to considerable uncertainty. In Ahamad's view, the forecasts published by NACTST failed to recognise the necessity of 'flexibility' in forecasting teacher supply. (Ahamad, 1970:35). As a result, the forecasts made by NACTST led in some cases to wrong policy decisions, based on predicted shortages or surpluses in teacher supply which failed to materialise. For example, NACTST forecasts in the 1950s had suggested that a surplus in teacher supply would develop in the 1960s. (NACTST, 1956:11). This led to a policy decision to increase the teacher training course from two to three years in 1960. However, because of large errors in the demographic forecasts, the demand for teachers was substantially under-estimated, and the forecast surplus became a shortage. The introduction of the three year training course in 1960 aggravated this shortage. (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:312).

The normal method used by NACTST was to forecast the 'supply' of teachers on the basis of assumptions made about recruitment and wastage, and to forecast the 'demand' for teachers based on

assumptions about pupil:teacher ratios, determined by a fairly arbitrary choice of the average size of class which, it was believed, would eliminate over-size classes. The differences between supply and demand were then interpreted as 'shortages' and 'surpluses' - and these were then used as a basis for recommendations about teacher supply policies. (Fowler, 1973:218).

There are, however, a number of great objections to the 'manpower planning approach' used by NACTST. First, there was no attempt to relate the total surpluses in the supply of teachers to regional disparities in the supply. It was assumed that the elimination of an over-all teacher supply shortage would remove any distributional or allocational problem between schools, areas or subjects. As a result, the Government was obliged to counteract this by instituting a 'quota system', in an attempt to allocate sufficient teachers between regions and areas. In 1956, the Ministry of Education had issued a circular introducing a new method of alleviating maldistribution by giving each LEA a precise objective - a quota - by which to formulate its staffing policies. (DES, 1968).

Second, NACTST made no detailed study of the 'wastage rate' of teachers, and failure to predict these wastage rates accurately was a major source of inaccuracy in the teacher supply forecasts. As Parry puts it, "The rate at which teachers leave the profession is vitally important when seeking to strike a balance between supply and demand, and is less amenable to Government control than the two factors already considered -

college output and pupil:teacher ratios." (Parry, 1972:18). Yet, it was only much later that some research was done as to why teachers leave teaching. (Drake, 1973:369).

Third, NACTST made great errors in forecasting the school population, since there was inadequate allowance made for increases in the birthrate, and for increases in the proportion of pupils staying on after the minimum school leaving age. Demographic forecasting over any lengthy period is always fraught with difficulty. (Ahamad, 1970:26).

Finally, the main criticism to be made of NACTST was that it chose to present its recommendations for teacher supply policies as 'single value forecasts' - even though it constantly under-estimated both recruitment and wastage. Some kind of 'sensitivity analysis' was necessary in such forecasting, in order to determine the sensitivity of projections for supply and demand of teachers to changes in basic assumptions. For example, a margin of plus or minus 5% in the supply and demand projections of the Fifth Report of NACTST would have indicated that, by 1968, the predicted surplus in the supply of teachers would have become a shortage of 30,000. This forecast might have persuaded the Government to introduce the three year training course for teachers in Colleges of Education more gradually, or to expand the number of student places at the same time. (Ahamad, 1970:36). Similarly, if an allowance had been made for a similar margin of error in the Ninth Report of NACTST, the forecast of a surplus in teacher supply in 1986 would have been subject to a margin of error of

minus 6,000, or plus 185,000. In short, different policy advice would have been given by NACTST if allowance had been made for this kind of sensitivity. (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:315).

Moreover, the emphasis on the simple forecasts of numbers disguised some of the real issues of teacher supply, namely how to reduce wastage, and how to improve the deployment of teachers. Such forecasts were concerned with 'quantity' not 'quality'. However, as this thesis will examine later, the forecasts prepared within the Department of Education and Science were subject to the same objections and criticisms as those made of NACTST.

The technical errors made by NACTST in its forecasts of teacher supply also caused considerable 'political' embarrassment to the Government. For example, following the optimistic forecast of teacher supply given in the Fifth Report of NACTST, the Government accepted the recommendation to increase the teacher training course from two to three years and, in June 1957, the Government announced that the teacher training course would be extended to three years in 1960. It soon became clear, however, that the assumptions made in its forecasts about wastage in the teaching profession and the size of the school population were hopelessly wrong. The next increase in teacher supply had dropped to just over 5,000 in 1957, compared with an average of 6,500 during the previous seven years. According to Manzer, a postponement of the three year training course would have been

welcomed by the Government, if the pressure groups in the education lobby had advocated it - but they did not, and in the circumstances the Government felt unable to reverse its policy. (Manzer, 1970:102).

NACTST also failed to realise what was the 'politically' relevant framework in which to make its recommendations about policies for teacher supply. For example, in its Ninth Report, NACTST recommended that the size of the teaching force of 360,000 in 1963 would have to be nearly doubled by 1983, in order to maintain current policy objectives on class size, and would need to grow to 750,000 if primary school classes were to be reduced to a maximum size of thirty pupils. (NACTST, 1965:17). Such a teaching force would outstrip all other professions in size and standards of qualification. To build up and sustain such a large teaching force would require about half the annual output of the total higher education system. In short, the Department of Education and Science, and the Secretary of State for Education and Science, were now receiving policy advice from an Advisory Committee which was no longer in a position to give it. Politically, NACTST had become no longer possible, or desirable.

According to PEP, as Advisory Committees become more 'general' in their investigations they begin to approach the political aspects of policy formation, and at this level powerful political forces come into operation, and Advisory Committees have no monopoly of influence. (PEP, 1960:146). According to Hicks, likewise, Advisory Committees have their greatest



influence and are most effective when the issues with which they are dealing are particular, rather than general, and non-political. The policy recommending function of an Advisory Committee operates best in the area of 'departmental administration' - with issues upon which policy must be formulated, but which are outside the area of political consideration. (Hicks, 1974:250). This analysis is borne out by the history of the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST).

In its early Reports, the First, Second, Third and Fourth, NACTST discussed the issue of teacher supply in the most general terms, and was very reluctant to make recommendations about policy beyond a narrow interpretation of its terms of reference. For example, in its First Report, NACTST examined very specific, and non-controversial, issues such as minimum entry requirements for Teacher Training Colleges, and the recruitment of mature students. In its Second Report, NACTST made a number of specific recommendations about the recruitment and training of Youth Leaders and Community Service Wardens. At no time in its Second Report did NACTST refer to its terms of reference, or display any reluctance to give advice on matters of policy. Even in its Third Report, which examined the shortage of graduate teachers of mathematics and science, NACTST did not feel able to make a recommendation upon what was a national issue: such a recommendation would have been beyond its terms of reference. Any recommendation to deal with the shortage of such teachers would have involved policy issues dealing with teachers' salaries, expenditure on school science

facilities, university places for science and mathematics, and on the extent to which the competing demands from industry should be satisfied. (Hicks, 1974:251).

From the evidence available, any recommendation which NACTST did make were always in line with departmental policy of the Department of Education and Science. For example, in the Fourth Report, NACTST made recommendations in line with the Department of Education on the training and supply of teachers for handicapped pupils. Similarly, in its Fifth and Sixth Reports, NACTST made recommendations on three year courses for the training of teachers in line with the policy of the Government. The Department of Education had already adopted a policy on this issue before NACTST published its Fifth Report. The recommendations of NACTST were quickly implemented by the Government in 1960. (Hicks, 1974:252).

Between 1949 and 1960 NACTST maintained a consensus of opinion upon a number of clearly defined issues, well within its terms of reference. It displayed little inclination to act independently as an 'Advisory Committee on Teacher Supply'. It provided a means of direct consultation between the Department of Education and the various pressure groups on issues not concerned with major areas of policy. In Wheare's words, "NACTST was body of experts captured by the Department." (Wheare, 1955:65). However, the critical shortages in teacher supply which became apparent in the early 1960s led the Government to involve NACTST in the issue of total teacher supply. In so doing, NACTST departed completely from its former

discussion of departmental policy: it entered an area with greater educational, social and economic implications than it had previously been involved in, and it moved for the first time into the area of major policy issues. (Hicks, 1974:252).

In its Seventh Report, published in 1962, NACTST recommended a great expansion in the Teacher Training Colleges to meet the great shortage in teacher supply envisaged by 1980. In its Eighth Report, which was its evidence to the Robbins Committee, NACTST put forward recommendations, not only on teacher supply, but also on the 'control' of teacher training. More important, for the first time NACTST was unable to produce a unanimous Report. In moving into the field of more general policy making NACTST found itself among the various political forces represented by the various pressure groups and partisans, which gave their own individual, and differing, policy recommendations to the Robbins Committee. By 1963 the membership of NACTST was composed of 58 members, including the Chairman, sixteen from the LEAs, seventeen from the Teachers' Associations, six from the ATOs, two from CVCP, eight from industry, commerce and other educational interests, and eight members appointed by the Minister of Education. (Manzer, 1970:106; and Hicks, 1974:249).

Finally, in its Ninth Report, NACTST not only analysed the problems of teacher supply, it also gave the Secretary of State for Education and Science its views on the policy it believed was necessary to deal with them, making general policy recommendations to the Government directly rather than through

a 'Committee of Inquiry' - as in its Eighth Report. (Hicks, 1974:256). Moreover, in its Ninth Report, NACTST made recommendations which were marked by a great deal of disssension and lack of consensus: while supporting the main recommendations, ten members of NACTST signed a supplementary minority report, and a lengthy note of dissent was also added. (NACTST, 1965:88-89, &.90-98). As a result, the Chairman of NACTST, Alan Bullock, resigned. His reasons for doing so are worth printing in full: "The divisions which had become apparent within the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers did not arise simply from the differences which an independent Chairman might hope to reconcile: they were the outcome of fundamental conflcits of interest about issues of national policy which required decision at the political level." (House of Commons, 1966, 714:86).

According to PEP, Advisory Committees are only likely to have influence with the decision making 'authorities' when they have unchallenged experts from all the relevant 'partisans': in such cases the Government cannot easily turn elsewhere for advice, or ignore advise already given. (PEP, 1960:98). By 1965, NACTST was no longer in this position. Even before the publication of the Ninth Report of NACTST, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Antony Crosland, had turned elsewhere for advice on teacher supply. His 'fourteen point programme' for improving the supply of teachers had come mainly from within the Department of Education and Science. The evidence suggests that the DES itself had by now come to regard NACTST

as superfluous. As one Civil Servant put it, in his evidence to the Select Committee on Education and Science, "There are simpler ways of getting to know what people think about a situation than having a vast debate among fifty people who have very little urgency to reach an agreement in reasonable time." (Select Committee, 1970:426).

Moreover, in making recommendations about teacher supply NACTST was assuming a role which the newly created - and more powerful - Department of Education and Science now regarded as being strictly within its area of policy formation. Indeed, according to Sir Herbert Andrew, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, the DES not only controlled the number of teachers in the education system, but also was able to exercise such control without consultation with interested parties. (Select Committee, 1970:419). According to Antony Crosland, Secretary of State for Education and Science, "NACTST was concerned with the future supply and demand for teachers. I thought that was a job which should be done inside the Department, and not by an amorphous outside body. If the Department could not do the job which was central to all its activities, it ought to pack up." (Kogan, 1971:173). From now on, as this thesis will later examine, policy recommendations in teacher supply were to remain firmly within the DES, and the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers ceased to exist.

## THE DEMAND FOR A NATIONAL INQUIRY INTO TEACHER TRAINING.

Towards the end of the 1960s other issues in the field of teacher training were beginning to appear. By the mid-1960s there had been a tremendous expansion in the number of student teachers entering the Colleges of Education and the Departments of Education in the Universities and, consequently, in the number of teachers entering the schools. (Layard and King, 1969:66, Table 15). By the beginning of the academic year 1967-68, the number of student places in the Colleges of Education had risen to 95,000 compared with the 75,000 proposed in the '80,000 place programme' of 1963. This expansion in the 'quantity' had been matched by an improvement in the 'quality' when the two year course had been lengthened to three years in 1960, and when BEd degree courses had been instituted in 1963. (Table 4). Towards the end of the 1960s, however, a reaction set in, and discontent with the 'content' of teacher training gradually became an issue among all sections of the teaching profession, and elsewhere.

First, there was a general consensus that considerable strain had been imposed on the Colleges of Education by: a) the introduction of the three year course;

b) the expansion of student numbers; and

c) the establishment of the BEd degree.

During this period the Colleges of Education often complained that they were being required to fulfil competing objectives, often with inadequate resources and facilities.

Second, in the schools, many teachers maintained that, despite the increase in the length of the teacher training course from two to three years, new entrants to the teaching profession still had large gaps in their education and training - gaps which had to be filled by the schools themselves. There was a general consensus that theory and practice during the courses in the Colleges of Education were seldom related: young teachers had never been taught many of the basic skills required, nor had they been exposed to some of the learning and teaching situations they subsequently experienced in schools. (Hencke, 1978:32). By 1969, the demand for a full scale inquiry into teacher training was beginning to grow louder. As Tibble puts it: "Criticism of teacher training is no new thing - but it has certainly risen to a crescendo in recent years, culminating in a demand from various quarters for some kind of 'national inquiry'. (Tibble, 1971:1).

There had been no full scale inquiry into teacher training since the McNair Report of 1944. The Robbins Report of 1963, although it had acknowledged that the health of the whole public system of education depended upon the efficiency of the Colleges of Education, had paid little attention to the 'content' of teacher training. As this thesis has already examined, the only recommendations of the Robbins Committee which affected teachers, and which were actually implemented, were that Teacher Training Colleges should be renamed Colleges of Education, and that BEd degrees should be established. In 1966, the Plowden Committee - in its Report on 'Primary

Education' - had strongly recommended that there should be a full scale inquiry into teacher training. (CAC, 1967, Plowden Report). In its second 'Annual Progress Report', published in 1969, the Plowden Committee again reiterated this view: "The training of teachers is of paramount importance, yet our recommendation that there should be a full scale inquiry into the training of teachers has not been heeded." (Education, 10 January 1969).

The two Advisory Committees able to carry out such an inquiry - the 'Central Advisory Council for Education' (CAC), and the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST) - by now had ceased to exist. As will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis, the Department of Education and Science was unwilling to revive them. Nor was the DES itself willing to institute such an inquiry into teacher training. (Willey & Maddison, 1971:26). Indeed, according to Sir Herbert Andrew, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, there were very good reasons for not doing so: "The Department is not at present contemplating any inquiry into teacher training. Our present broad view is that the Colleges of Education system has been so greatly expanded in the last few years that it really needs a period of consolidation, and perhaps a little more administrative and financial assistance than we have been able to give it, to strengthen those parts of it that tended to be overstrained by the great expansion. We think that it has done an extremely good job under the circumstances, and the people in them would do best to have a year or two of relative quiet." (Select



Committee, 1970:1). In 1969, however, on its own initiative, the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science began to conduct its own inquiry into teacher training.(5) The evidence presented to the Select Committee, which will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis, merely reinforced the demand for a full scale inquiry into teacher training. (Willey & Maddison, 1971:32).

The discontent with the situation of teacher training was even more widespread than had been thought. The Colleges of Education were particularly criticised by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). According to the NFER, the basic content of the teacher training course had changed little since the Second World War. Even the introduction of the three year course had resulted merely in the recrystallisation of the former pattern, in spite of the many discussions and controversies which preceded the change. As the NFER put it, "It is disturbing to note that for the majority of students the training course for intending teachers of infants is, broadly speaking, the same as that for the specialist teacher in the upper forms of the secondary school. This apparent indifference to educational innovation produces, in some cases, students who need training in their first year of teaching because of their ignorance." (Select Committee, 1970:217).

The general discontent with the content of teacher training led to a demand for a full scale inquiry into teacher training by the Teachers' Associations, particularly the National Union of

Teachers (NUT), and the National Association of Schoolmasters (NAS). (Select Committee, 1970:165). The pressure was further increased by a series of first ever national strikes by teachers in 1970 for higher salaries, thus increasing the general air of discontent in the teaching profession. (Burke, 1971). Gradually, the unwillingness of the Department of Education and Science to respond to the demand for an inquiry into teacher training began to lessen, particularly when Questions began to be asked in Parliament. In February 1970, Edward Short, Secretary of State for Education and Science, responded to the demand for an inquiry into teacher training - but it was only a 'partial response' to the issue. (Willey & Maddison, 1971:110). He decided that the inquiry into teacher training should be undertaken by the 'Area Training Organisations' (ATOs).

The ATOs were established following the recommendation of the McNair Report in 1944. In formal terms, ATOs were consortia of Universities, Colleges of Education, Local Education Authorities and Teachers' Associations, and recognised by the Department of Education and Science, under Teacher Training Regulations, as the bodies to award 'qualified teacher status'. The academic authority exercised by the ATOs was that of a University operating through its 'Institute of Education', and the qualification awarded was that of the University. (Lomax, 1976:150-174). It was to these Area Training Organisations that the Department of Education and Science now gave the inquiry into teacher training.

According to Edward Short, Secretary of State for Education and Science, the inquiry already being undertaken by the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science precluded a full scale inquiry into teacher training at this stage - even though the DES had previously been unwilling to undertake any kind of inquiry before the Select Committee had started its own. (Times Educational Supplement, 27 February 1970). Such a 'partial response', however, did not please any of the partisans or pressure groups which had been making a demand for a full scale inquiry into teacher training along the lines of the Robbins or Plowden Committees. (Times Educational Supplement, 24 April 1970). However, before either the Select Committee, or the Area Training Organisations, could issue a report, a General Election intervened, and in June 1970, the Labour Government fell from office. Nevertheless, the demand for an inquiry into teacher training still continued.

This demand was further increased, as will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis, by the growing realisation, at least within the Department of Education and Science, that there was an over-expansion in student numbers in the Colleges of Education and that, as a result of demographic changes, teacher 'supply' would soon outstrip 'demand'. The figures were confirmed by a DES Planning Paper. (DES, 1970, Planning Paper No.2). Any inquiry into teacher training would also have to take into account the whole issue of student 'numbers' and the 'costs' of the provision of higher education as a whole in England and Wales.

Some suggestions for limiting costs had already been made by Shirley Williams, Minister of State for Education and Science, in 'thirteen points' made at a meeting with the University Grants Committee and University Vice Chancellors, held at University College, London, in September 1969. Among these thirteen points were: greater selection for higher education; more productive use of facilities and greater scope for their joint use; the adoption of new forms of organisation; the expansion of part-time and correspondence courses; more intensive use of equipment; more economical construction of buildings; a change in the proportion of students who were residential, in lodgings, or at home; different types of student support; and changes in staff:student ratios. (Times, 26 September 1969).

The actual setting up of an inquiry into teacher training, however, was left to the incoming Conservative Government, under its new Secretary of State for Education and Science, Margaret Thatcher.

## Chapter 5. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. According to Boyle, this decision had the support of the University Grants Committee, and had been reached by the former Conservative Government in the previous summer: "The Conservative Government decided by the summer of 1964 to turn down the Robbins Committee recommendation, and they had the support of the UGC, which was understandably worried about the implications for university autonomy if there were to be a wholesale transfer of expenditure on the Colleges of Education to the UGC vote. If the Conservative Government had remained in power, it would have taken the same decision as the Labour Government". (Boyle, 1979:15).

2. Although this speech was delivered on the seventy fifth anniversary of the Woolwich Polytechnic, it was later issued - in a reduced form, and with a covering note - as an Administrative Memorandum and became an official statement of Government policy. (DES, 1965, The Role of Higher Education in Regional and Technical Colleges Engaged in Advanced Work. Administrative Memorandum 7/65).

The 'Woolwich Speech' was reinforced by a subsequent speech at the University of Lancaster, in January 1967. According to Robinson, the 'Woolwich Speech' drew freely upon a document produced by the ATTI, which had decided to seek the expansion of the maximum number of its Colleges outside the university sector, rather than the promotion of a limited number into it. (Robinson, 1968:29).

It is also to be noted that, as early as 24 February 1965 - two months before the 'Woolwich Speech' - Antony Crosland had announced in the House of Commons that, on the advice of the UGC, the Government had decided that no more new Universities, or accession to university status, would be needed for about ten years. According to Weaver, "It was at this point that the binary policy became inevitable." (Weaver, 1973:7).

3. Lukes, 1967:6-48; and Weaver, 1973:8-11.

According to Antony Crosland, there were six reasons for following a 'binary policy' in higher education:

a) The severely practical reason - that the system had existed for seventy years or more, so that there was no question of starting with a 'tabula rasa.' It would have been wrong to throw the Universities, Colleges and Local Education Authorities into a melting pot of administrative reform;

b) It was a valuable feature of the democratic tradition that elected representatives and local authorities should maintain a stake in higher education;

c) At a time of rapid expansion and changing ideas, what was wanted was a variety of institutions under different control, and not a monopoly situation implied by a unitary system;

d) There was an increasing demand for vocational, professional and industrially-based courses which could not be met by the Universities alone;

e) There was a virtue, as had been shown by other countries, in the concept of a non-university sector, which was at once degree-giving, vocationally orientated and professionally directed;

f) The non-university sector would be weakened and demoralised if the leading colleges, on achieving high standards, were automatically to be given university status.

4. It must be noted in this respect that Lord Hailsham, Secretary of State for Education and Science in the previous Conservative Government, said in the House of Commons that he also agreed with the Government's policy on this issue. (House of Commons, 1964, 703:1974). According to Boyle, as Minister of State for Education in the same Government, he had submitted a paper on similar lines to the binary policy to a Cabinet Committee almost a year before. (Boyle, 1979:16).

According to Robinson, "Because neither Party could afford to antagonize the local authorities, but also because each could

appreciate the economic realities, there was no serious possibility that the transfer of the Colleges of Education to university control would be implemented by either Party. (Robinson, 1968:26).

5. This particular Select Committee on Education and Science - one of the 'ad hoc' Select Committees set up by the Labour Government - was appointed on 22 February 1968, "To consider the activities of the Department of Education and Science, and to 'report thereon.'" As Taylor and Saunders put it, "A recent development has been the establishment of parliamentary Select Committees to consider specific areas of administration. The Select Committee concerned with education reported on the Department of Education and Science, with specific reference to Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1968), and staff-student relationships (1969). It began an inquiry into teacher training, which was not completed, but transferred to a non-parliamentary (i.e. departmental) Committee of Inquiry under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme." (Taylor and Saunders, 1971:6).

It must be remembered, however, that such Select Committees are relatively unimportant in policy formation. As Wheare has pointed out, "One striking difference of practice between this century and the nineteenth is the relative unimportance among 'Committees to Inquire' of Select Committees of the House of Commons. It is extremely rare for a Select Committee of the House to be charged with the investigation of some public issue, or some issue of economic, social or political life." (Wheare, 1955:70).

The above Select Committee on Education and Science was not re-appointed by the subsequent Conservative Government. As will be examined in Chapter 6 of this thesis, the Government does, in fact, have its own constitutional method of setting up its own Committees of Inquiry, and asking for specific information. Moreover, the latter are responsible to the Government which appointed them, the former to Parliament.

## REFERENCES

- Ahamad, W (1970), 'A Post Mortem on Teacher Supply Forecasts'. Higher Education Review, 2. 3, pp. 21-40.
- Ahamad, W and Blaug, M (1973), The Practice of Manpower Forecasting. Elsevier.
- Annan, N (1967), 'The Reform of Higher Education'. Political Quarterly, 38, pp. 234-252.
- Boyle, E (1966), 'Parliament and University Policy'. Minerva, 5. 1, pp. 3-19.
- Boyle, E (1979), Government, Parliament and the Robbins Report. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).
- Burgess, T (1978), 'Change and Content in Higher Education'. Higher Education Review, 11. 1, pp. 26-39.
- Burke, V (1971), Teachers in Turmoil. Penguin.
- CAC (1967), Children and their Primary Schools. (Plowden Report). HMSO.
- Committee on Higher Education (1963), Higher Education: a Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-63. (Robbins Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2154)
- DES (1965), The Role of Higher Education in Regional and Technical Colleges Engaged in Advanced Work. HMSO. (Administrative Memorandum 7/65).
- DES (1966), Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: Higher Education in the Further Education System. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 3006).
- DES (1966), Government of the Colleges of Education: Report of the Study Group under the Chairmanship of T R Weaver. (Weaver Report). HMSO.
- DES (1968), The Distribution of Teachers. HMSO. (Reports on Education, No.42).
- DES (1970), The Polytechnics. HMSO. (Reports on Education, No.65)
- DES (1970), Student Numbers in Higher Education in England and Wales: a Projection with Some Discussion of its Cost Implications. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, No.2).
- Drake, K (1973), 'The Scope for Economic Analysis', in: Lomax, D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.



- Fowler, G T (1972), 'The Binary<sup>149</sup> Policy in England and Wales', in: World Year Book of Education (1973). Evans.
- Fowler, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.
- Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the Reorganisation of Teacher Training, 1971-77. Penguin.
- Hewitt, S (1971), The Training of Teachers: a Factual Survey. University of London Press.
- HM Government (1965), National Plan HMSO. (Cmd. 2764).
- Hicks, D (1974), 'The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, 1949-65'. British Journal of Educational Studies, 22. 3, pp. 249-260.
- House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1964), Teacher Training Colleges: Report. Hansard, 703:1971.
- House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1965), Higher Education. Hansard, 707:390.
- House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1966), Hansard, 714:86.
- House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1965), Higher Education. Hansard, 270:1250 and 1279.
- House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), Teacher Training. HMSO. (HC 182).
- Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kogan, M (1971), The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in Conversation with Maurice Kogan. Penguin.
- Labour Party (1963), Higher and Further Education: Report of a Labour Party Study Group. (Taylor Report). Labour Party.
- Labour Party (1963), Report of the Sixty Second Annual Conference of the Labour Party. Labour Party.
- Layard, R, King, J and Moser, C (1968), The Impact of Robbins. Penguin.
- Lomax, D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.
- Lomax, D E (1976), European Perspectives in Teacher Education. Wiley.
- Lukes, J R (1967), 'The Binary Policy: a Critical Study'. Universities Quarterly, 22. 1, pp.6-46.
- Manzer, R A (1970), Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944. Manchester

University Press.

Matterson, A (1981), Polytechnics and Colleges: Control and Administration in the Public Sector of Higher Education. Longman.

National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce (1965), Committee on Technical College Resources: The Size of Classes and Approval of Further Education Courses. (Pilkington Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1951), Training and Supply of Teachers. (First Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1951), Recruitment and Training of Youth Leaders and Community Centre Wardens. (Second Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1953), Graduate Teachers of Mathematics and Science. (Third Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1954), Training and Supply of Teachers of Handicapped Pupils. (Fourth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1956), Three Year Training for Teachers. (Fifth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1957), Scope and Content of the Three Year Course of Teacher Training. (Sixth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1962), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1960-80. (Seventh Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1962), The Future Pattern of the Education and Training of Teachers. (Eighth Report). HMSO.

NACTST (1965), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1963-86. (Ninth Report). HMSO.

Niblett, W R (1975), The University Connection. National Foundation for Educational Research.

Ollerenshaw, K (1974), Returning to Teach. University of Lancaster Department of Educational Research.

Parry, J P (1972), The Lord James Tricycle: Some Notes on Teacher Education and Training. Allen & Unwin.

Payne, N P (1975), The Colleges of Education. Aspects of Education.

Political and Economic Planning (1960), Advisory Committees in British Government. Allen & Unwin.

Robinson, E E (1968), The New Polytechnics. Cornmarket.

Taylor, G and Saunders, J B (1976), The New Law of Education. Butterworths.

- Tibble, J W (1971), The Future of Teacher Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Vaizey, J and Sheehan, J (1968), Resources for Education. Allen & Unwin.
- Vig, N J (1968), Science and Technology in British Politics. Pergamon.
- Weaver, T (1973), Higher Education and the Polytechnics. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).
- Wheare, K C (1955), Government by Committee: an Essay on the British Constitution. Oxford University Press.
- Willey, F T, and Maddison, R E (1971), An Inquiry into Teacher Training. University of London Press.
- Williams, G (1973), 'The End of the Robbins Era', in: Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- World Year Book of Education, 1972-73 (1973). Evans.

## Chapter 6. THE JAMES COMMITTEE REPORT: A Policy for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Training.

An inquiry into teacher training had been part of the manifesto of the Conservative Party prior to the General Election of June 1970 and, when the Conservative Government took office, this was confirmed in the Queen's Speech in Parliament, in July 1970. The Conservative Party - no doubt for political gain - had clearly taken note of the feelings in the country at large, and of the evidence being presented to the Select Committee on Education and Science. As the Party Manifesto put it, "Concern about teacher training is widespread. We will initiate an inquiry into teacher training, as the Plowden Committee recommended. We wish the teaching profession to have a career structure which will attract recruits of high quality into the profession, and retain them." (Conservative Party Manifesto, 1970). The Labour Party's manifesto had made no mention of such an inquiry - although it did imply that there would be a need to review higher education as a whole. (Labour Party Manifesto, 1970).

As to the form which such an inquiry into teacher training should take, there was no lack of suggestions. These suggestions fell into two groups: those who favoured a small, select Committee of Inquiry, reporting back with the utmost speed; and those who supported a major, full scale, Committee of Inquiry, reporting back after due deliberation and research. As one commentator put it, "What we need is a small Committee of Inquiry, composed of men and women knowledgeable about

higher education. They should work pretty well full-time, for perhaps no more than three months." (Times Educational Supplement, 25 July 1970). But as another put it, "If Margaret Thatcher has her Committee of Inquiry, I hope that it will be a major one, since the public argument and discussion may serve to produce a 'consensus'. The much canvassed small Committee of Inquiry is scarcely likely to uncover the tablets of the law." (Times Educational Supplement, 24 July 1970).

The belief that the larger the committee, the greater the consensus of opinion was widespread. As Burgess puts it, "Such an inquiry not only sets in train its own research projects and - through its own discussions - represents, in a rough and ready way, the attitude of informed public opinion, it also sets off in public a debate among those chiefly concerned. By the time a Central Advisory Committee reports, its recommendations tend to come as no surprise, and they are regarded as broadly acceptable." (Burgess, 1971:13). From the evidence available, however, it is clear that what the Department of Education and Science wanted was a short, sharp inquiry into teacher training by a small, select Committee. Margaret Thatcher, as Secretary of State for Education and Science, wrote a letter to this effect in August 1970, seeking replies by October. This letter confirmed that the inquiries already being undertaken at the request of Edward Short, the former Secretary of State for Education and Science, would continue. These inquiries, together with the evidence previously collected by the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science, would be available to the new

Committee of Inquiry. (Times Educational Supplement, 28 August 1970).

Whatever the nature of the replies received in answer to the above letter, the small, select Committee of Inquiry was decided upon by the Secretary of State and the Department of Education and Science. While addressing the Conservative Party Conference in Blackpool, in October 1970, Margaret Thatcher announced that the inquiry into teacher training would be a short one, consisting of a number of people prepared to devote a large amount of time to it. It was announced that the Committee of Inquiry would start soon after Christmas, and its deliberations would last about a year. The Committee would examine how teachers were prepared for teaching, the three year teachers' certificate, and the one year Postgraduate Certificate of Education, and the BEd. degree. The Committee would also examine how the 'mono-technic' nature of the Colleges of Education could be broken down. (Times Educational Supplement, 9 October 1970).

The demand for an inquiry into teacher training had long been apparent. What was not so clear was 'why' the Government chose a small, select Committee of Inquiry to undertake this task - contrary to previous practice. As Edward Boyle, a former Minister of Education, has pointed out, "The Committee of Inquiry was a very different kind of committee from those which had issued the other major educational reports during the preceeding fifteen years. The Reports of the Central Advisory Council for Education, set up under the 1944 Education Act,

were all of them Reports by widely representative bodies, operating part-time, not paid by the Department of Education." (Ford, 1972:131). It is, therefore, necessary to examine why a Committee of Inquiry of this type - consisting of a small group of people working full-time and at such speed - was set up, rather than the more traditional type of Committee of Inquiry, which most - of not all - the pressure groups and partisans had asked for.

First, there was by this time no suitable Advisory Committee in existence able to conduct such an inquiry into teacher training. By 1970 the 'Central Advisory Councils on Education' and the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' had ceased to exist. Under the Education Act 1944, the Minister of Education had been required to appoint two Central Advisory Councils for Education, one for England, and one for Wales. (Education Act, 1944:section 4). The CACs were meant to be 'permanent' Advisory Committees and, as such, they were different from the 'ad hoc' Commissions, Committees and Working Parties mentioned elsewhere in this thesis. According to Corbett, the CACs were almost 'standing committees'. (Corbett, 1973:10). However, according to Sir Herbert Andrew, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, in his evidence to the Select Committee on Education and Science, "The effect of this section of the 1944 Education Act is that there should generally be 'Central Advisory Councils for Education'. I do not think it means that there should always, and at all times, be an active Central Advisory Council for England and Wales: it means that there should

generally be such bodies." (Select Committee, 1970:423).

The 1944 Education Act further laid down that the Central Advisory Councils should advise the Minister of Education upon such matters as they thought fit, and upon any issues referred to them by him. (Education Act, 1944:section 4,1). However, while in law the CACs could make their own terms of reference, in practice nearly all their reports - Crowther, Newsom, Plowden, had been based on terms of reference given to them by the Minister of Education. (Kogan, in: Fowler, 1973:162; and Kogan, in: Chapman, 1973:81). The Minister of Education also appointed the members of the Central Advisory Councils, and such appointments were only for a three year period. (Taylor and Saunders, 1971:5). As Kogan puts it, "The Central Advisory Councils were evidently devised to provide a continuing, ruminative and contemplative service to the education service, and no dramatic results could ever have been expected from their Reports." (Kogan, in: Fowler, 1973:164). The Central Advisory Councils had the function of summing up practices in education and the present state of progress as seen at the time their reports were written, and of identifying issues and demands. As Wheare explains it, "The report of the committee and its recommendations are expected to bear some relation to the evidence offered to it. Its verdict should not be contrary to the weight of the evidence. Its report should be something in the nature of a summing up and a judgement. It should constitute an authoritative contribution to the public discussion and consideration of the subject." (Wheare, 1955:69).



The evidence suggests that the Department of Education and Science, since its creation in 1964, had become dissatisfied with the work of the Central Advisory Councils. (Kogan, 1971:173). One reason was that the Secretary of State and the Department of Education and Science were forced to draw up for the CACs, irrespective of their own on-going policies, terms of reference which would command a consensus among the various educational pressure groups and partisans.

Second, the CAC would report back two or three years later, when the Government and the economic and political climate might have changed, and make wide and costly recommendations. The Reports of the CACs could either be an aid to a Minister, or Secretary of State, seeking more resources for education, or an embarrassment to them, if they did not obtain them, or wished to allocate them to the achievement of other objectives. In short, as Kogan points out, "The DES often had its own policy priorities and would not, therefore, particularly welcome powerful and forceful encouragement from one of its own Advisory Committees". (Kogan, in: Fowler, 1973:172). For example, Antony Crosland, Secretary of State for Education and Science at the time of the Plowden Committee, felt that there was a danger of too many, and too costly, reports, and they could slow up action, as the Plowden Report would have done on comprehensive reorganisation, if he had not been firm. (Kogan, 1971:174).

There is, thus, strong evidence to suggest that, by 1970, the

DES had become dissatisfied with the long drawn-out formal Committee of Inquiry. According to the Select Committee on Education and Science, the DES appeared to have an 'allergy' to such Committees, and had come to prefer instead the small departmental Committee. (Select Committee, 1970:427 & 424). Also, as examined in the previous chapter, there was little possibility of a consensus of opinion on teacher training among the members of a CAC type of Committee of Inquiry. According to Gordon Oakes, a former Minister of State for Higher Education, "Governments have not failed to revive the CACs because of any perverse animosity towards them, nor because of any desire to flout an Act of Parliament, but because it simply would not do to bring a group of people together unless there was an inquiry calling for the kind of examination only the CACs could conduct". (Times Educational Supplement, 22 October 1976). The result was that, by 1970, the Central Advisory Councils for Education were in abeyance, and had been since 1967, when the Plowden Committee in England, and the Gittins Committee in Wales, had reported on primary education. The terms of office of their members had expired in 1968, and no new members had been appointed. Antony Crosland never intended to reappoint them, and Edward Short and Margaret Thatcher, when Secretary of State for Education and Science, did not do so either. (Kogan, 1971:173).

The dissatisfaction of the DES with 'external' Advisory Committees is further evidenced by the history and demise of the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST). (Willey & Maddison, 1971:26, and Kogan &

Packwood, 1974:21). As this thesis has already examined in the previous chapter, NACTST had been established in 1949 to advise the Minister of Education in policy for ensuring that the country's schools would be properly and adequately staffed. NACTST issued its Ninth, and last, Report in 1965. It ceased to exist in 1968. Its members were not reappointed, and the then Secretary of State for Education and Science later declared that he had no intention of ever appointing NACTST again. As Antony Crosland put it, "I thought it was a job that should be done inside the Department of Education and Science, and not by an amorphous outside body. If the DES could not do the job, which was central to all its activities, it ought to pack it up". (Kogan, 1971:173). NACTST had also been guilty, as examined in the last chapter, of giving policy advice contrary to the wishes of the Government, or, as a Civil Servant put it more diplomatically later on, "Latterly the Secretary of State for Education and Science has come to think that NACTST was not functioning satisfactorily". (Weaver Report, 1970:4).

Therefore, Margaret Thatcher, as the new Secretary of State for Education and Science, was continuing the 'departmental' tradition when she decided to appoint a Committee of Inquiry into teacher training as a small, select committee, operating full time, and at great speed. According to Sir William Pile, Permanent (Under) Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science in 1970, "Ministers have come to see an increasing advantage in 'ad hoc' inquiries which can come to speedy conclusions. In the case of the James Committee, members were invited to serve full-time, in some case part-time, so

that they could complete their Report within twelve months - an arrangement which is likely to be more attractive to Ministers in future". (Pile, 1979:38).

Margaret Thatcher did not reconvene the Central Advisory Councils or the National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers: instead she adopted the new idea in educational policy making - the small, almost full-time, Committee of Inquiry. (Corbett, 1973:38). As Edward Boyle, a former Minister of Education put it, "The James Committee differs from all others in the important respect that it was full-time. This was no hasty decision: top officials within the Department of Education and Science had been inclined for some time, and certainly before the 1970 General Election, to the view that, if there was to be an inquiry into teacher training, a small team, working intensively at the subject, was likely to prove more worthwhile than a long drawn out inquiry on the model of the Robbins or Plowden Committee". (Boyle, 1972:6).

The commitment of the Secretary of State and the Department of Education and Science to the small, select Committee of Inquiry was beyond doubt, but so was the implication that the Government was no longer willing to surrender its role in policy making to an 'external' Advisory Committee. The responsibility for formulating and implementing policy now rested entirely with the Department of Education and Science: it was no longer to be given to external Committees. As Chapman puts it, "The preference for departmental bodies in recent years could be related to the increasingly important role and

technical specialization within the government bureaucracy, and that departmental committees are more obviously creatures of the Departments of State". (Chapman, 1973:175). Or again, "If Governments expect Commissions to formulate policy, Commissions may constitute a negation of governmental responsibility, for it could be argued that Governments should have clear ideas about what their policies should be, without depending on advisory bodies for ideas". (Chapman, 1973:184).

The evidence suggests that, by 1970, the Department of Education and Science wanted to be free to determine its own policy in the field of teacher training. The evidence also suggests that the Government, in the shape of the Department of Education and Science, already had some idea of what it wanted before it set up the James Committee, as later events will reveal. (1) When a Government normally sets up an Advisory Committee, or Committee of Inquiry, such committees are usually constrained by the 'topic'; the 'remit' - i.e. its terms of reference, whose wording very closely circumscribes the inquiries and discussions of the Committee; its 'personnel', i.e. Chairman, Secretary and Members; and the 'writing up' of the report by Civil Servants from the Department of State concerned. (Wheare, 1955:71).

In the case of the Committee of Inquiry into teacher training the choice of Chairman was very important because of all the various interests, pressure groups and partisans involved. A rumour spread, in August 1970, suggesting that, because no eminent academic person could spare so much time away from

his/her work, the Committee of Inquiry into teacher training would be chaired by a 'Civil Servant'. Although there were precedents for this, in that Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary of State at the Department Education and Science, had already chaired the Study Group which looked into the government of Colleges of Education (Weaver Report, 1966), this suggestion so upset the various interest groups that they made representations to the Secretary of State for Education and Science. (Ford, 1971:3). In the event, Lord James, Vice Chancellor of the University of York, was appointed Chairman in October 1970. (Times Educational Supplement, 30 October 1970). His position and views were well known. (Hencke, 1978:39). His appointment was regarded with favour by some, with disfavour by others. (Parry, 1972:13; and Burgess, 1971:12).

Lord James, who had been High Master of Manchester Grammar School before becoming Vice Chancellor of the University of York, was known as an elitist, a supporter of small select Universities, but he had an open mind about the future of teacher training, although his sympathies were known to lie entirely towards devising practical 'training' rather than academic 'education'. (Hencke, 1978:39). He made his views known on teacher training as early as November 1960 when he declared, "One wonders whether we may not look to a pattern where the Teacher Training Colleges expand themselves to include related occupations, like social service occupations, which would require arts training, whether it leads to a degree, or not. The nearest analogy is the 'Liberal Arts College' - I would prefer to call it a 'Junior College'". (Ford,

1960:133). On the same occasion, Lord James referred to those students who could, "No doubt get into the Teacher Training Colleges, but who would not be suitable for teaching, as well as those who just managed to scrape into a University." For these students Lord James suggested a kind of 'sub-university institution'.

Finally, Lord James had an antipathy towards the Universities' dominance of teacher training, especially towards the 'Area Training Organisations' and the 'Institutes of Education'. He believed that the latter exercised tutelage over the Colleges of Education, and encouraged bogus academic thinking in the study of education. (Hencke, 1978:39). His views are apparent in the James Report on 'Teacher Education and Training.'

The other members of the James Committee were appointed in December 1970, to begin work in January 1971. (Times Educational Supplement, 11 December 1970). Schools were represented by E Aggett, Head Teacher of the Eveline Lowe Primary School, and H G Judge, Head Teacher of Banbury School. Local Education Authorities were represented by C P Milroy, Chief Education Officer of Gloucestershire; Colleges of Education by J F Porter, Principal of Berkshire College of Education; and Universities by J R Webster, Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Wales, Bangor; Further and Advanced Further Education was represented by C R English, Director General of the City and Guilds of London Institute. The Assessor from the Department of Education and Science was A Luffman, HMI for Teacher Training; and the

Secretary to the James Committee was R Dellar, a Principal in the Civil Service.



## THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE JAMES COMMITTEE.

Margaret Thatcher had previously stated her purpose in setting up a Committee of Inquiry into teacher training when, in October 1970, she addressed the Conference of the Association of Education Committees:

"a) how to improve the education and professional training of teachers?

b) what types of course should be available for this purpose?

c) should teachers be prepared for their jobs together with students who have not yet chosen their careers?

d) what changes follow as desirable for the Colleges of Education?"

It is worth comparing these four questions with the 'terms of reference' actually given to the James Committee:

"In the light of the review currently being undertaken by the 'Area Training Organisations', and of the evidence published by the 'Select Committee on Education and Science', to inquire into the present arrangements for the education, training and probation of teachers in England and Wales, and, in particular, to examine:

a) what should be the content and organisation of the courses to be provided?

b) whether a large proportion of intending teachers should be educated with students who have not chosen their careers, or chosen other careers?

c) what, in the context of a) and b) above, should be the

role of the maintained and voluntary Colleges of Education, the Polytechnics, and further education institutions maintained by the Local Education Authorities, and the Universities? - and to make recommendations." (James Report, 1972:iii).

Under its terms of reference the James Committee was to be concerned solely with the reform of the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, and not with rationalization of teacher 'supply'. Similarly, the James Committee was not being asked to solve the problem of teacher education and training, rather it was being asked to examine a 'situation' in which there was an 'issue' of growing concern, both inside and outside the world of education, and to advise and make recommendations. As Armitage puts it, "The James Committee was not expected to perform the role of management consultants, and this is reflected in its composition. Its members were distinguished, and possessed diverse educational experience, but the over-all character of the James Committee was dilettante rather than technical." (Armitage, 1973:207).

Because of the full-time commitment of its members the James Committee was able to draw up a timetable for its work and, as will be seen, managed to keep to it. At its first meeting, on 13 January 1971, the James Committee outlined its programme of work for the next twelve months, dividing it into four phases. (Times Educational Supplement, 15 January 1971).

The first phase was almost completed in a week. The James Committee studied the evidence published by the House of

Commons Select Committee on Education and Science on 'Teacher Training', and started to look at the results of the inquiries being conducted by the 'Area Training Organisations' as they became available.

In the second phase the members of the James Committee visited a variety of Colleges of Education and University Institutes of Education. By March 1971, these visits were completed and, by Easter, the James Committee received all the oral and written evidence.

In the third phase, after Easter 1971, the James Committee started to consider areas of agreement and disagreement. According to Lord James, "Rather than including tables of statistics the James Report would be much more likely to give evidence as to where the statistics could be found." (Times Educational Supplement, 22 January 1971).

Finally, in its fourth phase, the James Committee wrote the bulk of its Report during the summer holidays. Again, according to Lord James, "We should seriously be discussing drafts by 1 October 1971. We should have something fairly good to go on by then." (Times Educational Supplement, 22 January 1971).

#### THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED TO THE JAMES COMMITTEE.

In order to fully understand and appreciate the subsequent recommendations of the James Committee for the education and training of teachers, it is necessary to undertake an extensive

analysis of the evidence submitted to the James Committee, and to examine the views and opinions of the various partisans and pressure groups who submitted this evidence. It must be stressed, however, that such evidence obviously reflects the views and policies of the pressure groups and partisans submitting it, and such bias has to be borne in mind when considering its importance and value. In particular, there is a clear dichotomy between those who regarded teacher education and training in terms of its 'academic content' and its closer links with the university sector of higher education, and those who regarded it in terms of 'supply and numbers' and its links with the public sector.(2) Broadly speaking, the Teachers' Associations favoured an improved academic content for the education and training of teachers and closer links with the university sector, while the Local Education Authorities, though not averse to improved academic content in theory, in practice were more concerned with keeping the education and training of teachers under public sector control.

One of the main criticisms made of the James Committee is that it simply issued a 'Report' - it did not publish, in a comprehensive or referenced form, any of the evidence submitted to it. The Report merely contains a series of appendices listing the sources of written and oral evidence submitted to the James Committee: it does not contain any of this evidence. (James Report, 1972:81-94). Instead, the James Committee claimed to proceed in the light of the reviews already being undertaken by the Area Training Organisations at the request of Edward Short, the former Secretary of State for Education and

Science, and of the evidence already published by the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science in its Report, 'Teacher Training'. (James Report, 1972:2). The James Committee itself also received 500 submissions of 'written evidence' from individuals, associations and organisations, and spent twenty three working days hearing 'oral evidence' from individuals and representative bodies. (James Report, 1972:2 & 81-94). Members of the James Committee also visited nearly 50 institutions - Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges of Education, at which they had the opportunity to talk to staff and students. (James Report, 1972: 2 & 95). Thus, the James Committee had massive evidence on which to work and base its recommendations. However, none of this evidence, nor any direct reference to it, is made in the James Report itself.

This analysis of the evidence presented to the James Committee first examines the published evidence presented to the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science, and the reviews undertaken by the Area Training Organisations. Second, it examines the evidence, both written and oral, submitted direct to the James Committee by the various partisans and pressure groups concerned with the education and training of teachers. This evidence, taken as a whole, pointed to four main areas of concern:

1. The 'personal education' of teachers in the Colleges of Education, including standards of entry, content of courses, and awards received, together with the mono-technic nature of the vast majority of Colleges of Education. (James Report,

1972:40).

2. The 'professional training' of teachers, including induction into schools and the profession, teaching practice and the probationary year, and whether such professional training should be concurrent or consecutive. (James Report, 1972:41).

3. The 'in-service education and training' of teachers after a few years in the profession, including the provision of opportunities for such in-service training, and the courses provided. (James Report, 1972:5).

4. The 'control' of teacher education and training, including the whole question of closer university links, or otherwise, the role of the Area Training Organisations and the Institutes of Education.

In short, there was a general concern with the 'content' and 'control' of education and training - concern first expressed to the Select Committee on Education and Science, and subsequently to the James Committee.

## THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.

It was the growing concern with the issue of teacher education and training which led, in the first instance, to the original investigations of the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science, and to the repeated demand for an inquiry into the education and training of teachers. There was a general concern with the courses provided in the Colleges of Education, and a universal consensus that something needed to be done about them.

## 1. The Personal Education of Teachers.

According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, there was a widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of the 'personal education' provided in the Colleges of Education. No one unequivocally defended the existing content of the three year certificate course for teachers, except a few people then involved as teachers in the Colleges of Education. (Select Committee, 1970:1232). According to the NAS, the whole basis of the teacher education courses was out of date. (Select Committee, 1970:165). According to the NFER, there had been relatively little change in the curriculum of the Colleges of Education since the War, despite the great changes in schools. (Select Committee, 1970:217). According to the NAHT, the extension of the college course to three years had not in fact led to the emergence of better educated teachers. (Select Committee, 1970:30). The NAHT also believed that the expansion of the Colleges of Education had led to the acceptance of

students whose suitability for teaching had not been adequately assessed, and whose educational attainments left much to be desired in certain cases. (Select Committee, 1970:29).

According to the AMC, the quality of college entrants had declined as a consequence of the expansion of the Universities, and the AMC put this forward as a reason why three years was now needed to educate college students effectively. (Select Committee, 1970:98). The AEC also expressed dissatisfaction with the work of the Colleges of Education, and reported that an inquiry among the Head Teachers of one Local Education Authority had revealed that, on balance, they thought that the two year trained teachers were better than the three year trained. (Select Committee, 1970:121).

According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, much of the confusion over what should be taught in the Colleges of Education arose because there was a lack of definition about what a newly-qualified teacher was, and should be, expected to do. For example, the NAS pressed for a 'job analysis' to determine what teachers were actually doing in the classroom at the various levels of school education, and asserted that there must be research into what teachers were actually doing in the classroom so that present college courses could be reviewed, and teachers more adequately prepared to face the immediate demands of the job. (Select Committee, 1970:165 & 52).

In particular, according to the evidence submitted to the



Select Committee, there was grave discontent with the content and structure of the BEd degree. For example, the AMC, UCET and ATCDE, NUT and NUS all deplored the difference in entrance qualifications demanded by one University or another. (Select Committee, 1970:192, 366, 145 & 200). The AMC expressed serious reservations about the relevance of the BEd degree and the way it was developing. It also criticised the decision of some Universities to grant the BEd degree as a pass degree, others to make it a classified honours degree. (Select Committee, 1970:91, 105, & 148). According to the AEC, the BEd degree was redundant if concerned with teacher training, and believed that it should be treated like any other degree if it was meant to be an academic qualification. (Select Committee, 1970:124).

According to some of the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, for example the AMC, teaching for the three year certificate course would be adversely affected by the Colleges of Education concentrating their resources on the BEd degree courses. (Select Committee, 1970:962). According to the NAS, the BEd degree course had damaged the professional content of the teacher training course by switching the emphasis to academic content. (Select Committee, 1970:166 & 170). The NUT disliked the way the BEd degree had developed, and the NAS objected to its limited market value. (Select Committee, 1970:147 & 174).

Finally, according to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, Colleges of Education should be no longer regarded exclusively as institutions for the training of teachers, i.e.

they should lose their 'mono-technic nature'. Some proposed that the Colleges of Education should become 'Liberal Arts Colleges', offering a general higher education to students, many of whom - it was hoped - would opt for teaching. (Select Committee, 1970:109, 114, 116, 118 & 331). Others proposed that the Colleges of Education should open their doors to those intending to train for professions in the social services, so that teachers would be taught, for example, with students intending to become probation officers. Some felt that future teachers would gain a wider experience, if they were trained with students of other disciplines. (Select Committee, 1970:136, 114, 1128 & 1560).

## 2. The Professional Training of Teachers.

According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, there was considerable dissatisfaction with the professional training given to students in the Colleges of education. First, it was generally felt that the existing courses would gain from the students being given more 'practical' training, particularly in such things as the teaching of reading, the teaching of science and the teaching of ethnic minority children. (Select Committee, 1970:218, 1061, 1072, 1195, 1589, 1629 & 1631).

Second, great concern was also expressed about the unsatisfactory nature of the arrangements made for 'teaching practice' by many of the Colleges of Education. According to the NAHT, "Teacher training will never be adequate unless the

schools are involved in an entirely new way in the professional task of forming new teachers. Closer liaison between colleges and schools is not only desirable, but essential, if the present enormous training operation is to be successful." (Select Committee, 1970:30). According to the NAS, "Links between colleges and schools must be strengthened so that serving teachers take a more important role in the training of students, especially in periods of teaching practice". (Select Committee, 1970:166). Similarly, according to the NUT, "The existing teacher should have more to do with the training of the new teacher in the school." (Select Committee, 1970:160).

The main solution offered by those submitting evidence to the Select Committee to the issue of teaching practice was the appointment within the schools of particular teachers to act as 'teacher tutors', with specific responsibilities towards the students sent to the school on teaching practice. The concept of teacher tutors was not in itself new - the idea had first been suggested by the McNair Report in 1943. The latter had called for 'school based tutors' to be involved in teacher training, "To express the principle that in teaching, as in other professions, it should be a privilege and a responsibility for outstanding practitioners to take a definite, and not merely incidental and casual, share in training their successors." (McNair Report, 1943:paras. 261 & 271).

Finally, there was great dissatisfaction with the existing 'probationary year' as part of the professional training of

teachers: "In theory, it is an essential part of the grant of qualified teacher status - in practice, circumstances make it little more than a fiasco." (Willey & Maddison, 1971:56). According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, it was generally felt that the probationary year should be more positively a period of training. (Select Committee, 1970:50). According to both the NAHT and the NUT, the probationary year should be treated more seriously, both as a training period, and as a testing time for new teachers. (Select Committee, 1970:36 & 151).

### 3. The Inservice Education and Training of Teachers.

According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, the 'inservice education and training of teachers' was the one area about which there was almost universal and general consensus. For example, UCET, ATCDE, NAHT, NUT and NAS all agreed on the importance of inservice education and training. (Select Committee, 1970:32, 150, 166, 198 & 365). However, according to the NFER, inservice education and training was in a confused and incoherent state, while the absence of any over-all national policy was distressing, but true. (Select Committee, 1970:219 & 231).

### 4. The Control of Teacher Education and Training.

According to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee on Education and Science, the most crucial area of concern was the administration and government of the Colleges of Education, and

their organisation and position within the structure of higher education. The Colleges of Education themselves complained of the divided 'control' to which they were subject - the Department of Education and Science and the Local Education Authorities on the one hand, and the Universities and Area Training Organisations on the other. (Select Committee, 1970:17 & 21).

In the evidence submitted to the Select Committee the solution generally agreed to the issue of the control of teacher education and training was for the Colleges of Education to be more closely 'integrated' into the Universities, either by the absorption of the Colleges of Education into the existing university structure, or by their amalgamation with the Universities in new 'Comprehensive Universities'. (Select Committee, 1970: 22, 102, 103, 126, 135, & 370). The control of the Colleges of Education would thus become part of the autonomous university sector of higher education.

Finally, according to the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, there was a demand for providing ways and means of 'co-ordinating' the whole policy of teacher education and training - a demand supported by the AMC and AEC, UCET and ATCDE, NUT, NAS and NUS. It was agreed that there should be an effective national body to keep the changing pattern of higher education, including teacher education and training under constant review. (Select Committee, 1970: 12, 84, 95, 116, 120, 164, 178, 182, 192, 201, 217, 310 & 392). In short, there was general agreement that there should be an 'Advisory Committee'

or a 'Higher Education Commission' to replace the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers.

In total, as Warren points out, there were thirteen points concerning teacher education and training about which there was a general consensus of opinion among those submitting evidence to the Select Committee on Education and Science.(3) As the following analysis will reveal, the same four areas of concern outlined in the evidence submitted to the Select Committee were repeated and reinforced by the reviews conducted by the Area Training Organisations and by the evidence submitted, and resubmitted directly to the James Committee. This analysis is based, in the main, on the evidence submitted to the James Committee by the following associations:

#### LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY ASSOCIATIONS:

Association of Education Committees  
 Association of Municipal Corporations  
 County Councils Association  
 Inner London Education Authority  
 Society of Education Officers

#### HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS:

Association of Colleges of Further and Higher Education  
 Association of Principals of Technical Institutions  
 Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education  
 Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions  
 Association of University Teachers



Committee of Directors of Polytechnics

Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals of University  
Institutions

Standing Conference of Heads of Departments of Education in  
Polytechnics

Universities Council on the Education of Teachers

University of London Institute of Education

#### SCHOOL TEACHERS ASSOCIATIONS:

Association of Assistant Mistresses

Assistant Masters Association

Association of Head Mistresses

Head Masters Association

Head Masters Conference

National Association of Head Teachers

National Association of Schoolmasters

National Union of Teachers

#### STUDENT TEACHERS ASSOCIATIONS:

National Union of Students

University of London Institute of Education Students'  
Association



## THE JAMES COMMITTEE.

## 1. The Personal Education of Teachers.

According to the AMC, in its evidence to the James Committee, there was little point in making extravagant demands for the future of teacher education and training without examining the Colleges of Education in their present context. The future of the Colleges of Education was inextricably linked to the wider issue of policy in the whole area of higher education. (AMC, 1971:2). According to the ATCDE, the aims of teacher education needed to be clarified: "There is no consensus of professional and lay opinion on what the role of the teacher is, how it should be performed, and how individuals should be prepared for it. There is a tendency for the Colleges of Education to include too much, for students to expect too much, and for the schools to demand too much." (ATCDE, 1971:3). According to the NAS, it was no longer sufficient to supply increased quantities of the old product. The time had come to improve the quality of the teaching force. This view was supported by the ULIE: "Greater emphasis must be placed on practical preparation for teaching by a clearer analysis of the skills to be acquired, based on a combination of systematic preparation for the classroom in the Colleges of Education and the actual practice in the schools. A serious study of the purposes and means of practical preparation should be undertaken forthwith." (ULIE, 1971:5).

The evidence presented to the James Committee also favoured a

'deferred commitment to teaching'. According to the ATCDE, for example, some students were forced into premature decisions which they subsequently regretted. As things stood, they either left college altogether or remained with, at best, a lukewarm attitude to the career for which they were preparing. There was an increasing reluctance among students to commit themselves to a single career at eighteen and, particularly, to teaching. They wanted to keep their options open: "It has long been apparent that the appeal of the Colleges of Education has held steady over the past five years, with the percentage of students with 'A' Levels going into the Colleges of Education rising rapidly. However, recruitment to the Colleges of Education this year was well below the government target." (ATCDE, 1971:3).

According to the majority of the evidence presented to the James Committee, the solution to this issue was for the Colleges of Education to lose their 'mono-technic' nature. According to ULIE, for example, "If the country feels that it cannot afford university education for as large a proportion of those qualified as it has in the recent past, there is a case for using the Colleges of Education to take some of those who would until now have gone to the Universities. This means that the Colleges of Education must be able to enter students for first degrees. As there is an increasing desire on the part of students in the Colleges of Education not to be firmly committed to teaching until after the period of higher education and, as the continued education of future teachers before they start professional training is much to be desired, there is a

conjunction of interests of which advantage should be taken." (ULIE, 1971:22). This view was supported by the NUT. (NUT, 1971:46).

According to the ATCDE, the Colleges of Education should take more students and develop into 'poly-technic' institutions, teaching for university degrees in different faculties, rather than confining themselves to the BEd degree. (ATCDE, 1971:4). According to the ULIESA, Colleges of Education should be freed from the straight-jacket of their present mono-technic nature, while the UCET believed that the Colleges of Education should keep a special responsibility for the education and training of teachers, but that they should not be limited to this role. (UCET, 1971:8). According to the ACFHE and APTI, the isolation of Colleges of Education should be ended: teachers should study alongside engineers, surveyors, managers, accountants and other professionals. (Education, 21 May 1971).

Also, according to the AMC, students from other disciplines should be welcomed into the Colleges of Education. The AMC wanted to see a more varied pattern of teacher education and training, in which there might be an extended use of the Polytechnics, and the conversion of existing Colleges of Education into institutions where future teachers would study alongside students working towards a career in the social services. However, according to the AMC, "An open ended, no commitment, situation can hardly commend itself. (AMC, 1971:4). Likewise, according to the ILEA, the Colleges of Education should expand their scope to include social work and similar

courses. (ILEA, 1971:18).

According to the evidence presented to the James Committee, there was a consensus of opinion that the entry standards to Colleges of Education should be increased and that the awards given should be of 'degree status'. According to the ATCDE, for example, Colleges of Education should raise their entrance requirements. If they were to secure students of an appropriate calibre, two 'A' Level passes should become the minimum requirement for Colleges of Education, with courses leading to an ordinary BEd degree. (ATCDE, 1971:5). According to the HMA and HMC the low level of the entry requirement deterred many students from applying for places at Colleges of Education, because it created doubts about a profession to which entry was so comparatively easy: "What is required is evidence of study beyond 'O' Level in some definite subject area. Admission for the majority should be based on the satisfactory conclusion of full-time education up to the age of eighteen." (HMA-HMC, 1972:6). The NAS believed that all intending teachers should have to meet university entrance requirements, and that teacher education and training should last four years, and lead to a university degree. (Education, 27 August 1971). Similarly, the NUT proposed that there should be a new degree structure preparing teachers for university degrees after three years, and that the colleges' admissions policies should equate teaching with other forms of higher education, and demand two passes at 'A' Level for entry by 1980. (NUT, 1971:33). According to the ILEA, the three year certificate course should be upgraded to pass degree standard,

and the entry requirements should increase as a result. (ILEA, 1971:8). The NUS supported a basic three year degree course, with a fourth year of more advanced study available to all students who wanted it. (NUS, 1971:7).

The AEC proposed a four year course leading to the award of an ordinary degree: "The creation of a trained graduate profession is the right ultimate goal." (AEC, 1971:1). The SCHDEP also believed that teaching should be an all-graduate profession, with a minimum of four years education and training. (SCHDEP, 1971:25). Finally, according to the UCET, Colleges of Education should become part of the higher education system, with minimum standards of entry closer to those of the Universities and the Polytechnics. (UCET, 1971:9).

Indeed, only a minority of the evidence submitted to the James Committee dissented from the above views. For example, the SEO believed it would be wrong to insist upon entry qualifications to Colleges of Education equivalent to those required for undertaking a degree course: a minimum of five 'O' Level passes, plus evidence of further study beyond 'O' Level should only be required. There should, however, be opportunities for a degree award. (Education, 28 August 1971).

## 2. The Professional Training of Teachers.

Many of those submitting evidence to the James Committee, because of their desire to see a deferred commitment to teaching, believed that there should be a 'two part course' for

intending teachers - the first part dealing with 'personal education', and the second part with 'professional training'. The ATCDE, for example, suggested a 'part one course' lasting two years, not necessarily geared to teaching, but ending in a recognised award. (ATCDE, 1971:5). The HMA and HMC also supported the idea of a two part course, part one lasting two years, and based on a number of optional courses, including both academic subjects and an introduction to school experience, while part two would provide professional training for intending teachers. (HMA-HMC, 1972:9).

In the evidence presented to the James Committee there was also general agreement that there should be a switch from 'concurrent' to 'consecutive' training, i.e. that the teacher's professional training should come after his/her academic or general education. This was the result of the desire to see the mono-technic nature of the Colleges of Education lessened, and their role widened to include the education of other professionals. The idea usually put forward was for a 'foundation course' - usually of two years, followed by another two years of professional training for intending teachers. For example, the HMA and HMC suggested that there should be a part two professional training for teachers with the emphasis on practical training. (HMC-HMA, 1972:10). As its proposal for professional training the ATCDE suggested a one year intensive curriculum-centred course with qualified teacher status only to be awarded after a further satisfactory year's school-based training as a 'graduate trainee'. (ATCDE, 1971:8). In the view of the NUT, all teachers should prepare for university degrees

over three years, plus one year of postgraduate professional training. (NUT, 1971:33). The NAS outlined two course patterns for professional training - one a university degree plus professional training, the other two years professional training, plus two years of personal education. (Education, 27 August 1971). Finally, according to the AEC there should be two routes to the status of qualified teacher - the four year College of Education course, and the three year University degree course, followed by a year of professional training, half of which would be spent in schools. The AEC was as anxious that teachers should be trained, as that they should be graduates. (AEC, 1971:1).

All the evidence submitted to the James Committee was agreed that the 'quality' of the teachers' professional training should be improved. According to the ILEA, one in five teachers in London had received no training in the teaching of reading; a further third said that their training had been unhelpful. The ILEA was also concerned that half of the teachers recently qualified had received no specific training in teaching children of ethnic origin, or emotionally disturbed children. Four out of ten teachers reported that the teaching of able and socially deprived children had had no place in their training. Finally, according to the ILEA, the most common criticism of the courses in Colleges of Education was that they paid too little attention to teaching methods in schools. (ILEA, 1971:15). Similarly, according to the NUS, there was widespread disenchantment among students in Colleges of Education with their courses of professional training: over half did not feel

that their course had equipped them for teaching. In the view of the NUS, more 'teaching practice' was required. (Education, 4 June 1971). The AEC also supported longer periods of teaching practice. (AEC, 1971:1).

Furthermore, according to the evidence presented to the James Committee, there was - coupled with the demand for better professional training, a strong desire to strengthen the 'induction' of new teachers by integrating the 'probationary year' more fully into the professional training of teachers in schools. As the ATCDE put it, "At present, there is an abrupt, and ill-prepared, transition from being a student, to being a qualified teacher with full professional responsibility. The supervision and help available in their first year of appointment is inadequate. We recommend that the first year in service should be regarded as a bridge between pre-service education and full professional status, and used as a period of further training and professional induction". (ATCDE, 1971:7). The ULIESA also believed that the probationary year should be made a more integrated part of teacher training, and that a two year postgraduate course should be experimented with. (Times Educational Supplement, 7 May 1971).

The policy advocated by those submitting evidence to the James Committee for making the probationary year more effective was a system of 'teacher tutors'. According to the HMA and HMC, ways should be found to ensure that schools took, and were able to take, their responsibility for the professional training of teachers more seriously. According to the HMA and HMC, there



should be four types of teacher tutor - co-ordinating, joint, group and associate. (HMA-HMC, 1972:14). According to the ULIESA, teacher tutors should be part of the solution to the issue of how to create more links between schools and the Colleges of Education. (Times Educational Supplement, 7 May 1971). The NAS believed that the probationary year should be of a different form, and be regarded more as a 'fifth year' of training. The newly qualified teacher should begin by spending part of his/her time in continued study under the guidance of a teacher tutor, and the remainder in the classroom, gradually working up to a full timetable. (Education, 27 August 1971).

Much of the evidence submitted to the James Committee suggested that 'qualified teacher status' should be withheld until after the student teacher had completed his/her personal education, professional training and probationary year. Hence, there were suggestions for teacher aides, assistant teachers and graduate trainees. According to the NAHT, for example, their suggestion for 'teacher aids' was based on the principle that a teacher's professional training should be far more school based: "It seems to us unrealistic to declare that a teacher is trained, without first seeing whether s/he can stand up to the strain of a complete school term." (Education, 30 April 1971). The HMA and HMC also believed that a teacher should qualify only after successful completion of a further induction year, after two years of personal education and one year's professional training. (HMA-HMC, 1971:14). Similarly, the SEO supported a foundation course of two years, followed by one year of supervised probationary training, before the award of a

teaching certificate, and by yet another year of study leading to the award of a pass or honours degree. (Education, 28 May 1971).

Finally, as mentioned above, according to the ATCDE, qualified teacher status should only be awarded after a satisfactory year of school based training as a 'graduate trainee'. During this training year the graduate trainee should be the responsibility of the Head Teacher of the school to which s/he had been appointed, and Head Teachers should be given appropriate resources - in the form of teacher tutors - to enable them to discharge their responsibilities adequately. Graduate trainees should be relieved of teaching duties for one day of each week for the purposes of further study under the supervision of teacher tutors, with attendance at a Teachers' Centre, College of Education, or Institute of Education being compulsory. (ATCDE, 1971:8).

### 3. The Inservice Education and Training of Teachers.

Among those submitting evidence to the James Committee there was almost unanimous and universal agreement about the need for greater 'inservice education and training' for teachers. For example, according to the AEC, "Inservice education and training must, in future, be regarded as an essential part of the total training of teachers". (AEC, 1971:1). According to the HMA and HMC, a term's inservice education and training after four or five year's teaching was the absolute minimum. (HMA-HMC, 1972:19). According to the NUT, it should be one year

in ten; (NUT, 1971:73); according to the AEC one in five. (AEC, 1971:2). The ATCDE regarded initial and inservice education and training as two stages in a professional continuum. The two stages should be planned in relation to each other, rather than separately, so that they might complement and support each other. (ATCDE, 1971:11).

Some of those submitting evidence to the James Committee, however, realised that inservice education and training on a large scale would be achieved only if the Department of Education and Science adopted a policy of having a larger teaching force in the country as a whole and, therefore, a higher total number of students in Colleges and Departments of Education at any one time. (HMA-HMC, 1972:21). Nevertheless, few of those presenting evidence to the James Committee were able to quantify the exact number of teachers required to achieve the ideal state of inservice education and training. According to the AEC, for example, stability in numbers would be reached when the teaching force had increased to 450,000. The actual output from the Colleges of Education needed to sustain this figure would be 32,000, which would require the provision of only 64,000 student teacher places. The increase in the number of postgraduate student teacher places in Colleges of Education would raise this figure by between 7,000 and 8,000 - but this would leave a 'surplus' of 40,000 student teacher places unfilled. By now there were nearly 114,000 places in the Colleges and Departments of Education. (Table 2). According to the AEC, the extra places should be used for a substantial increase in inservice education and training. (AEC,

1971:2).

As this thesis will examine later, the whole issue of 'numbers' will play a large part in the formation of policy for the education and training of teachers in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion.' Similarly with 'costs'. According to the evidence presented to the James Committee, approximately 5 million pounds was currently being spent each year on inservice education and training for teachers, of which 4 million pounds was spent on one year full-time secondments. If every teacher was to have a one year secondment every ten years, the annual expenditure required would be 70 million pounds. (Education, 22 January 1971). Again, as this thesis will examine later, the costs of one sector, or one level, or one aspect of education will become a question of priorities for the Government in the formation of policy for the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion.'

#### 4. The Control of Teacher Education and Training.

It was in the area of the 'control' of teacher education and training, its organisation and structure, that there was little over-all consensus in the evidence presented to the James Committee. The university and college based associations, together with the teacher and student based associations, as was to be expected, favoured closer links with the 'autonomous sector', while the local education authority based associations favoured closer links with the 'public sector'.

According to the AMC, the Local Education Authorities regarded their financial stake in higher education as justifying their right to exercise control over any regional organisation for Colleges of Education. (AMC, 1971:4). The CCA also supported the view that Local Education Authorities should continue to play a major part in the education and training of teachers. (Education, 6 August 1971).

According to the AEC, teacher education and training should be organised on a regional basis in future, with representatives from the Local Education Authorities, the Teachers' Associations, the Colleges of Education, the Universities and the Voluntary Bodies. The AEC did not believe that the existing system of 'Area Training Organisations' was satisfactory. To justify its arguments the AEC pointed out that the proportion of the age group entering higher education would soon approximate to that which twenty years previously had received a grammar school education. The AEC also believed that initial

training courses for teachers should be carried out in Colleges of Education, and that initial training in Universities should be discontinued. (AEC, 1971:1). The ILEA also supported the idea of Colleges of Education developing a status independent of the Universities, but equal to that of other institutions of higher education in the 'public sector', such as the Polytechnics. (ILEA, 1971:18).

The university and college based associations, on the other hand, in their evidence to the James Committee, strongly expressed the view that the Universities should continue to be directly involved with the initial education and training of teachers, as well as with advanced work and research. As the UCET put it, "We think it right and proper that university institutions should have some direct and continuous responsibility for the education and training of teachers and the staffing of schools. We think it important that the determination of curricula and syllabuses in the Colleges of Education should be largely influenced by independent bodies - the Universities, who can powerfully guarantee the integrity of the studies which intending teachers undertake." (UCET, 1971:4).

According to the ATCDE, the Universities should continue to be responsible for the academic and professional standards of entrants to the teaching profession, and that Colleges of Education should become constituent colleges of the Universities, and not merely the limbs of Institutes of Education. (ATCDE, 1971:16). The ULIESA believed that the

Colleges of Education should be merged into the Departments of Education in the Universities. (Times Educational Supplement, 7 May 1971).

Similarly, in their evidence to the James Committee, the teacher and student based associations favoured closer links with the Universities on the lines of the recommendations of the Robbins Report, i.e. in university 'Schools of Education'. (Education, 27 August 1971). Some of those submitting evidence to the James Committee called for the total integration of higher education into 'Comprehensive Universities' - with a 'Higher Education Grants Committee', on the analogy of the University Grants Committee.

According to the NUT, for example, teacher education and training should take place in comprehensive Universities, and Colleges of Education should cease in their present form. Each University would have a 'School of Education', responsible for education throughout the University, which would replace the Area Training Organisation. Finally, according to the NUT, there should be a 'Higher Education Grants Committee' - which would replace the existing binary system, whereby the autonomous sector was controlled by the University Grants Committee, and the public sector by the Local Education Authorities. (NUT, 1971:90). The ATCDE proposed a 'College Grants Committee' - which would be responsible for allocating finance directly to the Colleges of Education according to their assessed needs. (ATCDE, 1971:21).

Similarly, the NUS believed that teacher education and training should be incorporated into a comprehensive system of higher education, with future planning and development in the hands of a 'Higher Education Commission'. According to the NUS, there should also be a new validating body: "In proposing the replacement of both the present three year teachers' certificate and the four year BEd degree by a four year degree course, we thus envisage the establishment of a national organisation, the 'Council for Education Academic Awards', to approve and moderate all courses leading to qualified teacher status." (NUS, 1971:2).

Finally, on the 'control' of teacher education and training, several of those submitting evidence to the James Committee made proposals for a 'national' Advisory Committee. For example, according to the NUT, there should be a 'National Advisory Council on the Education, Training and Supply of Teachers'. (NUT, 1971:92). According to the CCA, a 'Central Teaching Council' should be set up, with substantial Local Education Authority representation, and responsible for the financial policy and control of professional education and training for teachers. (Education, 6 August 1971). However, as this thesis will examine later, the issue of the machinery for the 'control' of teacher education and training, together with the issue of the 'autonomous sector' as opposed to the 'public sector' of higher education, will be the crucial ones for consideration in the formation of policy for the education and training of teachers in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'.



From the above analysis of the evidence presented to the James Committee, there was the following consensus of opinion concerning the 'content' of teacher education and training. First, that there should be a higher standard of 'personal education' for all teachers, and teaching should become an 'all-graduate profession', with all teachers receiving degrees; and that there should be a breakdown of the 'monotechnic nature' of Colleges of Education. Second, that there should be better 'professional training', with more involvement of schools in the teacher training process. Finally, that there should be more 'inservice education and training'.

From the same analysis, it is clear that on the 'control' of teacher education and training, the main issue facing the James Committee was how to arrange the links between the Universities, the Polytechnics and the Colleges of Education on the one hand, and the Local Education Authorities on the other.

It now remains to examine how the 'recommendations' of the James Committee met the wishes of the partisans and pressure groups who submitted evidence to it.

## THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JAMES COMMITTEE.

The Report of the James Committee, entitled 'Teacher Education and Training', was published on 25 January 1972. Its terms of reference had led it to examine the 'content' and the 'control' of teacher education and training:

"What should be the content and organisation of courses to be provided, whether a larger proportion of intending teachers should be educated with students who have not chosen their careers, or chosen other careers. (CONTENT). What should be the role of the maintained and voluntary Colleges of Education, the Polytechnics and other Further Education institutions maintained by Local Education Authorities, and the Universities." (CONTROL) (James Report, 1972:11).

In the case of the latter, the majority of those submitting evidence to the James Committee had favoured closer links with the Universities. This the James Report failed to recommend - although two of its members did submit a 'Note of Extension'. (James Report, 1972:78). This issue produced the strongest reaction, as the James Committee believed it would, and was always likely to produce the greatest political impact. (James Report, 1972:55).

The Control of Teacher Education and Training.

On the question of 'control' the James Report recommended a fundamental review of the regional and national organisation of

teacher education and training. The Report expressed the view that the existing system, with the Colleges of Education linked to Universities through the Area Training Organisations, had outlived its usefulness: "A new system will be needed to 'respond' not only to the pressures for change in the existing 'situation', but also to the heavy additional 'demands' which these new factors will imply." (James Report, 1972:51).

To replace the Area Training Organisations, the James Report recommended the setting up of a new regional agency, to be called the 'Regional Council for Colleges and Departments of Education' (RCCDEs), each with its own Director and Staff, its own sources of finance from the Department of Education and Science, and its own premises: "Each RCCDE should represent, and bring into partnership, all the Colleges of Education, Polytechnics and Universities, and all the Local Education Authorities in the Region. Its Governing Council should be as small as would be consistent with adequate representation of the interests involved, and much of its effective power should be delegated to appropriate committees. (James Report, 1972:56).

At the national level, the James Report recommended the setting up of a 'National Council for Teacher Education and Training' (NCTET) - which would be responsible for awarding the proposed BA(Ed) degree and the MA(Ed), as well as the proposed Diploma in Higher Education. The NCTET would also establish guidelines on the academic awards acceptable for entry to professional training for teachers. (James Report, 1972:57). Although the James Report recommended that the NCTET should be able to make

'policy decisions', it did realise that this would not really be possible: no Government would be willing to surrender its power to a non-elected body. Similarly, the James Committee also realised that the 'allocation of resources' was a political matter: "Although the observations of the NCTET might be sought on the total 'supply' of teachers, and the amount of money to be committed to their education and training, it would not be within the power of the NCTET to make decisions on either question. Such decisions would clearly be 'political' and, therefore, the prerogative of central and local government." (James Report, 1972:59).

Finally, on the 'control' of teacher education and training, the James Report did not feel able to support demands for a 'Higher Education Grants Committee' on the lines of the University Grants Committee: "It has been argued that a 'Central Grants Committee' should be established to review the whole field of expenditure on higher education, or that - at least - there should be a parallel agency to the University Grants Committee, to consider all higher education in the 'public sector'. There is clearly some force in the argument that decisions about the allocation of total resources for higher education could be made more effectively in some agency covering the whole field, but it is also clear that, in accepting invitations to explore the wider area, we should be exceeding the limits of our 'terms of reference'". (James Report, 1972:63).

On the question of the 'content' of teacher education and training the recommendations of the James Report were more in agreement with the weight of evidence submitted to it, i.e. for the creation of an 'all-graduate profession', the separation of foundation 'personal education' from consecutive 'professional training', a better organised 'induction and probationary period' - but it was in the specific detail of its recommendations that the James Report aroused such criticism and reactions.

First, in line with the evidence submitted to it, the James Report upheld the widespread misgivings about the existing 'content' of teacher education and training, and expressed the need for radical reform: "Changes must be made if the needs of the schools, and of society, over the next twenty years are to be met, and the system cannot be expected to reform itself as rapidly, and as fundamentally, as the 'situation' requires." (James Report, 1972:1). To bring about this reform, the James Report recommended a new 'three cycle' pattern of teacher education and training, consisting of two years 'personal education', two years 'professional training' and, subsequently, 'inservice education and training'. (James Report, 1972:3).

The first cycle of 'personal education' would consist of either a degree, awarded by a University or the CNAA, or a new award - to be called the 'Diploma in Higher Education' (DipHE). The award of a degree or DipHE would admit the holder to the second

cycle. (James Report, 1972:14). In the second cycle the 'professional training' of teachers would consist of a two year course, the first year spent in a College of Education or a Department of Education in a University or Polytechnic, at the end of which students would become 'licensed teachers', and spend the second year of the cycle in a school under the guidance of a 'professional tutor'. Students who completed this second cycle of professional training would be recognised as 'registered teachers', and would be awarded a BA(Ed). At the end of this cycle, or at the end of further teaching experience, opportunities would be available for a further one year course leading to the award of an MA(Ed). (James Report, 1972:11).

Finally, in the third cycle, the James Report recommended that all teachers should be entitled to release, with pay, for 'inservice education and training, on a scale not less than one term in every seven years and, as soon as possible, on a scale of one term in every five years. (James Report, 1972:12). The James Report also recommended that the existing BEd degree should be extensively developed as an inservice award. (James Report, 1972:10).

The James Committee itself realised that some of the recommendations in its Report would inevitably produce some adverse reactions. For example, in proposing the DipHE, the James Committee anticipated the likely criticism that it would be intended mainly for primary teachers, particularly since it recommended that the new award should be introduced initially

in Colleges of Education and Departments of Education in Polytechnics: " It cannot be over-emphasised that the proposed DipHE should not be equated with the preparation of primary teachers, nor exclusively with the education of teachers." (James Report, 1972:68).

Moreover, although the James Report declared that, "Inadequacy in teacher education and training arises from an unhelpful distinction between two kinds of training - one route for 'graduates' and another for 'non-graduates' - under its recommendations there would still be two routes to qualified teacher status, one lasting four years via the DipHE and the BA(Ed), the other lasting five years, via a university degree and the BA(Ed), and to the possession, therefore, of two degrees. The James Report expressed the hope that, "There should be no implication that one route is more difficult, or more prestigious, than the other". (James Report, 1972:68). Such hopes, as this thesis will examine, were not to be realised.

#### THE REACTIONS TO THE JAMES REPORT.

The James Report was published immediately as a 'Green Paper' for consultation. (James Report, 1972:v). However, Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science, addressing the House of Commons in February 1972, stated that she did not expect formal consultations about its recommendations to begin until after Easter 1972. She added that, while she was anxious to avoid delay, she could not at

that stage say how long consultations with the partisans and pressure groups would take, nor how soon she would be able to announce a 'policy' for the education and training of teachers. More than thirty organisations had been identified whose views would have to be taken into account formally before the Government formulated its policy. Those organisations not formally consulted were at liberty to send in their views to the Department of Education and Science. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 18 February 1972).

Hence, in analysing the reactions produced by the James Report, a clear distinction has to be made between immediate reactions, given 'off the cuff' - as it were, by individuals, or by individuals expressing 'unofficially' the views of their associations or organisations, and the 'official' reactions published by the same associations and organisations after due thought and consideration. (Eggleston, 1972:v). These immediate, unofficial reactions, were unlikely to be taken into account in the formation of policy for the education and training of teachers.(4)

#### The Control of Teacher Education and Training.

One obvious implication of the recommendations of the James Report was that the links between the Universities and the Colleges of Education in their present form should be ended - contrary to the weight of evidence submitted to the James Committee. (Lomax, 1973:171). Another implication was that any move towards a 'comprehensive' system of higher education,



based on the Universities, would be made more difficult by the creation of three separately administered sectors of higher education - the Universities, the Polytechnics and the Colleges of Education - in a 'trinary system'. (Ford, 1971:5). Hence, the reactions among the partisans and pressure groups concerning the 'control' of teacher education and training.

According to the AUT, the recommendations of the James Report would mean the separation of the education and training of teachers into a third, cheap, sector of higher education, which would inevitably become the last choice for most students. (AUT, 1972:1). Similarly, according to the ACFHE, it would be most undesirable if methods of alleviating the 'mono-technic nature' of Colleges of Education led to the creation of a 'second' public sector of higher education separate from the Polytechnics. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 3 March 1972). According to the ULIE, the James Report did not show whether the charge that Colleges of Education were held in 'tutelege' to the Universities represented the weight of evidence submitted: "There is no doubt that, among the Colleges of Education in the University of London Institute of Education, the overwhelming majority of teachers wish to retain the university link." (ULIE, 1972:12). Finally, the CVCP published a severe critique of the James Report, also opposing the separation of the Universities from the Colleges of Education, and declaring that it would be preferable to work towards an all-graduate profession by developing further the existing four year degree BEd degree. (CVCP, 1972:5).

The CVCP also objected to the recommendation of the James Report for 'Regional Councils for Colleges and Departments of Education' (RCCDEs), insisting that for the purposes of academic validation of teacher education and training courses, and the planning of inservice education and training the partnership of interest between the Universities and the Colleges of Education should continue. (CVCP, 1972:5). According to the AUT, the proposed RCCDEs were likely to be, "A rootless collection of representatives". Instead, the AUT favoured the re-grouping of the existing Institutes of Education with redrawn boundaries. (AUT, 1972:8). According to the UCET also, the existing Area Training Organisations should be redesigned to bring in those Universities outside the existing system, and to spread the Colleges of Education more evenly among them. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 26 May 1972).

There was strong criticism that the James Report did not recommend a 'comprehensive' higher education system. According to the ATTI, for example, it was highly undesirable to organise certain areas of higher education in isolation from the rest. Any recommendation for restructuring teacher education and training should be of a kind that would fit into a over-all policy which made cooperation, coordination and planning easier, and which would lead to a unified system of higher education. (ATTI, 1972:5).

Although many of those submitting evidence to the James Committee had supported a 'National Advisory Committee' for

teacher education and training, there was little support for the 'National Council for Teacher Education and Training' (NCTET) recommended by the James Report, either in its membership or its functions. According to the NUT, for example, the teacher representatives on the NCTET should be nominated by the Teachers' Associations. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 10 March 1972). According to the UCET, there should be a National Advisory Committee for teacher education and training with two functions exercised through two Committees - one concerned with 'content', offering advice on professional matters; the other concerned with 'supply', acting as a sounding board for all matters affecting the policy, planning and supply of teacher education and training. (Times Educational Supplement, 26 May 1972).

In short, many Teachers' Associations did not agree that the former 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST had been a failure, as the James Report declared. They, therefore, rejected as unacceptable the 'National Council on Teacher Education and Training' as recommended by the James Report. They sent a joint letter to Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science, requesting that a 'National Advisory Council' - similar to the NACTST, but with more power - be set up as soon as possible. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 1 December 1972). This new National Advisory Council would advise the Secretary of State for Education and Science on 'policy' concerned with the education, training and supply of teachers. (Education, 1 December 1972). Such requests, as this thesis

will examine, were to be rejected by the Government in its subsequent White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'.

#### The Content of Teacher Education and Training.

According to McConnel and Fry, at the heart of many of the reactions to the recommendations of the James Report was the pre-occupation, even obsession, with university status. (McConnel & Fry, 1972:13). As was to be expected, all the teacher and student based associations opposed the recommendations of the James Report for the 'control' of teacher education and training, believing that there should be closer links with the 'autonomous sector' of higher education, rather than the 'public sector'. This same pre-occupation with the university link, both academic and administrative, was apparent in the reactions to the recommendations of the James Report for the 'content' of teacher education and training.

First, however, reactions to the recommendations for 'inservice education and training' were generally favourable, although some suspicion was expressed that the 'third cycle' had been put first in the James Report to lessen any unfavourable reaction to the first and second cycles. (NUT, 1972:4). The main criticisms on the 'content' of teacher education and training were directed at the recommendations for the BA(Ed) and the DipHE. Indeed, only the HMA and HMC gave the James Report's recommendations an unqualified welcome: "It can be welcomed as a consistent and coherent plan for reforming the profession of teaching, and giving it a higher status than ever before by

means of new and attractive courses of training". (Times Educational Supplement, 17 March 1972).

In its recommendation for the BA(Ed) the James Report had failed to realise that what nearly all the partisans and pressure groups demanded was an all-graduate profession, with all teachers obtaining degrees before they did their professional training. (Ford, 1972:129). The BA(Ed) did not satisfy this demand. There was a general consensus that it would be inferior in quality and course requirements to the standard university degree. According to the CVCP, "The proposed scope and pattern of the BA(Ed) degree would have more in common with an award of a professional, rather than an academic, institution, and it would be likely to have little more favourable recognition than the existing teachers' certificate for admission to advanced courses of higher education". (CVCP, 1972:2). Similarly, according to the AUT, the James Report sought to create an all-graduate profession at the stroke of a pen, while actually reducing the quality of the education and training below that of many certificate courses. (AUT, 1972:2).

According to the ATCDE, the BA(Ed) was not credible as a degree. The course on which it was based was not capable of being controlled by a single awarding body: it was a fragmented and unrelated experience, to be awarded after the person concerned had been on the job for one year. It was, therefore, a mark of professional recognition rather than an academic or professional award. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 19 May

1972). According to the CDP, it was also doubtful whether the James Report's recommendation would achieve an all-graduate profession: "We find it difficult to accept that all those who have completed the first and second cycles in the form presented in the James Report will have reached a standard normally expected of a university or CNAA graduate." (CDP, 1972:3).

It was generally agreed that, because of its inferior quality, neither the Universities nor the CNAA would validate the BA(Ed) and, therefore, it would have little value or standing outside the teaching profession. Moreover, the BA(Ed) would be inferior to 'real' degrees already in the profession. According to the ULIE, for example, "The BA(Ed) degree proposed by the James Report would not be recognised anywhere as a real degree. What is more, the new degree is to be called 'a degree in education', although the serious study of education as a subject has no place in it." (ULIE, 1972:9).

Similarly, in the case of the DipHE there was a general consensus that it would be regarded as of low status. According to the NUT, for example, the recommendation to establish a qualification quite unrelated to teacher education would lower the educational and professional standing of Colleges of Education, and leave the Polytechnics and Universities virtually unaffected. (NUT, 1972:13). There was particular criticism of the fact that the DipHE was meant mainly for teachers. According to the ULIE, Colleges of Education would be singled out as the home of an award that was clearly inferior

to a degree, with a subsequent professional award that was not to be given the seal of a University at all. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 19 May 1972). According to the SCHDEP, "We reject the recommendation for the DipHE, if this is provided for the education of teachers only, or mounted exclusively in Colleges of Education and Departments of Education in Polytechnics." (Times Higher Education Supplement, 9 June 1972). There was also widespread dissatisfaction that the DipHE was to be awarded by the National Council for Teacher Education and Training (NCTET) through the RCCDEs. The James Committee itself had anticipated this criticism, however, by recommending that ultimately the CNAA should validate the DipHE. (James Report, 1972:55).

Finally, there was a widely-held belief that the DipHE was designed to provide education on the cheap. According to the AUT, the DipHE would be used, whatever the intention, to provide a second rate form of higher education for those students who would otherwise have gone to University or Polytechnic to take a degree course. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 28 January 1972). It was believed that the DipHE and the BA(Ed) were part of a plan by the James Committee to create a third sector of higher education for educationally less privileged students - a fact which Lord James himself later denied. (Teacher, 12 May 1972).

The answer to many of the above criticisms was that the DipHE should not be intended only for students in Colleges of Education intending to become teachers. It was believed that

the attitude of the Universities to the DipHE would be crucial to its development. For example, the ATCDE believed that the DipHE would be credible only if it were integrated into the existing award structure of higher education and awarded by either the Universities or by the CNAAB. (ATCDE, 1972:8). Similarly, according to the UCET, the DipHE would gain currency only if it was established throughout higher education, and not confined to Colleges of Education. The Diploma should be so planned and organised so as to form a qualification for further study leading to a higher award such as a degree, and enable its holder to undertake professional training not only in teaching, but in other careers as well. (UCET, 1972, Interim Statement on James). According to the AEC also, the DipHE should be accepted for entry to other professions, and as part of a degree course in Universities. (AEC, 1972:1). Finally, according to the UCET, the DipHE would be more widely accepted if entry requirements were the same as those required for entry to higher education in general, i.e. two 'A' Level passes. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 26 May 1972).

Given the above provisos, the reactions to the DipHE as recommended by the James Report generally lessened. According to Harry Judge, a member of the James Committee, "There has emerged an impressive system of support for a two year qualification to be developed alongside the present system of awards. Quite rightly, it has been urged that this should be validated by the CNAAB or the Universities, that its currency should be widely accepted, and that it should not be available exclusively in Colleges of Education." (Times Higher Education



Supplement, 24 March 1972).

There was no such agreement with regard to the BA(Ed). As far as the various educational pressure groups and partisans were concerned, the only worthwhile and desirable qualification for an all-graduate teaching profession was a three or four year degree in education, complete in itself, followed by an adequately supervised period of probation and inservice education and training. What the pressure groups and partisans did not want, and what the James Committee had failed to understand in its interpretation of the evidence submitted to it, was two separate courses, run in two separate institutions, and rewarded with two separate qualifications, awarded by two separate bodies. (Logan, 1972:26). This is what they repeated in the 'consultations' with the Secretary of State for Education and Science, with - as will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis - some success.

According to the ATCDE, there should be three and four year professional degrees in education, to be awarded by the Universities or the CNAA. Such degrees would indicate a given standard of achievement in the theory and practice of education. They should be accepted as a professional qualification, and need no additional support from other and separate qualifications. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 19 May 1972). The SCHDEP also agreed that the initial qualification for all teachers should be a degree validated by the Universities or the CNAA. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 9 June 1972). This was supported by the AQT and the

UCET. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 17 March 1972). According to the UCET, the Universities should examine sympathetically the possibility of establishing a three year course leading to the award of an ordinary degree. The UCET also supported the retention of the four year BEd honours degree. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 26 May 1972). Finally, according to the NUT, such degree courses in education should be established in Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges of Education. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 10 March 1972).

The demand for an all-graduate teaching profession along the above lines was given added weight when the CNAA came out in support of a three year degree course in educational studies, as an alternative to the recommendation of the James Report. (Education, 15 September 1972). After discussions with Margaret Thatcher, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, the CNAA issued a 'policy statement': "The concept of a three year degree course in educational studies, leading either to an honours or an unclassified degree, will be acceptable, provided that it contains an adequate period of practical experience in the classroom, with a requisite minimum of academic studies." (Times Higher Education Supplement, 10 November 1972).

From the evidence available, it became increasingly probable that, as the year went on and consultations proceeded, a three year degree course in educational studies might be part of a policy decision by the Government on teacher education and training. In November 1972, the CNAA was recognised by the

Department of Education and Science as a 'relevant organisation' for the purposes of teacher training, which meant that the CNAA now had the same responsibility as the Area Training Organisations for recommending student teachers to the Secretary of State for Education and Science for qualified teacher status. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 17 November 1972). The way was now open for the Government's policy decision on the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training in its White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'.

### The Supply of Teacher Education and Training.

According to Williams, "The changes proposed by the James Report, if implemented, would represent changes of infinitely more importance than the wrangles about degree validation or status." (Williams, 1972). There is very strong evidence that any government decision on the James Report would have to take into account not only the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, but also 'supply' - an issue which was virtually omitted from the evidence submitted to the James Committee, and from its subsequent recommendations.

The trend towards a 'surplus' of teachers and student places in the Colleges of Education had been noted even before the James Committee had been set up, and it gradually became clear that a decision would have to be made on this issue very soon, and very urgently.(5) As the James Report itself put it, "To put it bluntly, the 'supply' of new teachers is now increasing so rapidly that it must soon catch up with any likely assessment of future demand, and choices will have to be made very soon between various ways of using, or diverting, some of the resources at present invested in the education and training of teachers." (James Report, 1972:75). The question arises, however, as to 'why' there was no real discussion of teacher supply in the James Report - apart from this one sentence, and 'why' there was such an element of secrecy about teacher numbers, so much so that it was believed in some quarters that there had been a deliberate 'conspiracy of silence'. (Hencke, 1978:46).

First, there was a lack of published evidence and statistics in the James Report. Indeed, one of the main criticisms of the James Report is that it failed to publish any evidence to substantiate its recommendations, or any indication of what these recommendations would cost. As Ford puts it, "The (James) Committee of Inquiry was asked to report within twelve months, and as a result its published Report is almost entirely lacking in the kind of essential evidence, and logistic and financial projections which were a feature of the Robbins Report". (Ford, 1972). Moreover, the evidence suggests that it was government policy not to publish the evidence presented to the James Committee, either in written, or oral, form. On two separate occasions, in debates in the House of Commons, Margaret Thatcher, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, refused to publish the evidence presented, and on the question of costs she merely replied that she had initiated a study within the Department of Education and Science, and that costs were being prepared on a number of different assumptions. She added that statistics about future teacher 'supply' were being prepared by the DES, and she hoped that these would soon be available. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 18 February 1972 & 21 April 1972).

The refusal by the Government and the Department of Education and Science to publish the evidence or the statistics which lay behind the recommendations of the James Report led some observers to put forward a 'conspiracy theory'.<sup>(6)</sup> According to Hencke, for example, there was every reason to believe that -

even before the James Committee was appointed, and certainly while it was sitting - it became obvious to the Civil Servants at the Department of Education and Science that the 'supply' of teachers would soon outstrip 'demand', and that there would inevitably be a surplus of teachers and student places in the Colleges of Education. This, in Hencke's view, was the real reason behind the recommendation of the James Report for a 'third sector' of higher education - a sector in which the DipHE was meant to mop up the surplus places in Colleges of Education. Since, according to Hencke, the James Committee was unwilling, or unable, to publish the statistics at its disposal to substantiate its recommendations, the 'third sector' did not appear to make sense. Hence, according to Hencke, the unjustified criticism and reactions from the various educational pressure groups and partisans. (Hencke, 1978:39-47).

There is some evidence to support the view that the surplus in teacher 'supply' was becoming apparent to Civil Servants in the Department of Education and Science. As Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary at the DES responsible for higher education, including teacher education, training and supply, put it, "The problems of teacher supply provided the Department with what was perhaps the most severe and unremitting logistical problem that it had to tackle throughout the quarter century that ended in 1970. By that date, however, the picture had been transformed. A steady flow of new teachers, the prospect of a substantial fall in the birth-rate, and a sudden reduction in the rate of teacher wastage combined to produce the spectre of

a growing reservoir of trained teachers whom Local Education Authorities would be unable, or unwilling, to employ." (Weaver, 1979:68). Nevertheless, it is obvious that Hencke is looking at the issue of teacher supply with unnecessary suspicion and from a position of hindsight. Both the James Committee and the Department of Education and Science have repeatedly denied that the 'supply' of teachers was of particular concern to the James Committee. As one member of the James Committee commented, "In 1972 no one would believe that we would very soon have too many teachers." (Times Educational Supplement, 25 June 1976). They have also denied that there was any 'conspiracy' to keep the evidence and statistics a secret. (Harding, 1978).

Moreover, it must be remembered that, under its terms of reference, the James Committee was concerned with the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, not 'supply': it was concerned with 'reform', not 'rationalization'. The latter was the responsibility of the Department of Education and Science which, as will be examined in next chapter of this thesis, regarded the 'supply' of teachers and the control of teacher 'numbers' as its own particular policy concern. It must also be remembered that the 'forecasts' of teacher supply had not been very accurate during the 1960s, and they only began to improve as the 1970s progressed - something which even Hencke admits. (Hencke, 1978:114). According to Hugh Harding, Assistant (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, even when the DES submitted a planning paper to the James Committee, entitled 'Teacher Training Places in Higher Education and Teacher Supply' - indicating how soon, and how

much, teacher supply might need to 'contract', it did not affect the recommendations of the James Committee at all. (Harding, 1978). By now, the Department of Education and Science had long since ceased to regard policy for teacher supply as being within the province of one of its own Advisory Committees. The whole issue of 'supply' in the formation of policy for the education and training of teachers will be examined in the last two chapters of this thesis.

Finally, as the year 1972 progressed, it also became clear that financial considerations and the allocation of resources were going to play a major part in government policy for teacher education and training. Any decision on the recommendations of the James Report, in particular, would be linked to decisions on higher education, in general, and both would be greatly influenced by the economic situation. The Government would need to establish a list of priorities in dealing with 'public expenditure programmes' and, as a result, the proposed White Paper would have to look at several areas of education and educational expenditure at once. As Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science, expressed it in a statement in the House of Commons, in October 1972, "Decisions on the James Report would come before the end of the year. The Government hoped to announce extensive decisions, including the James Report and the quinquennial settlement, which would to some extent include decisions about the polytechnic programme. The future of Colleges of Education would be included in these decisions." (Times Higher Education Supplement, 21 October 1972). There is, in fact, some evidence that the White Paper on



'Public Expenditure', due to be published in November 1972, was delayed while the whole pattern of expenditure on higher education was scrutinised. In the end, both the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', and the White Paper on 'Public Expenditure' were published in concert, and in complement to each other. (DES, 1972 & HM Treasury, 1972).

It now remains to examine 'how', and 'why', the policy for the education and training of teachers recommended by the James Report was adopted, adapted or otherwise altered by the Government and the Department of Education and Science in the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion.'

## Chapter 6. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. According to Parry, "As early as Easter 1971, it was said, the 'further education solution' for the Colleges of Education had been reached by a majority decision in the James Committee. It would not be unreasonable to assume that this was the solution intended by those responsible for advising on the Committee's membership." (Parry, 1972:14).

According to Chapman, a Committee of Inquiry may be defined as, "A body set up by a Government to consider a specific problem, or problems. It works within fairly clearly indicated constraints of time, resources and, in particular, the political environment. It may have a party political role which, when present, is concealed as far as possible behind a neutral facade". (Chapman, 1973:9). According to Wheare, such a Committee of Inquiry may be used by a Government in four ways - to pacify, to delay, to nullify, to camouflage. (Wheare, 1955:89-92). According to Fowler, "The value of a Committee's work may not lie in its recommendations. Apart from the attraction that the establishment of a Committee may put a troublesome topic on ice, its appeal to the Secretary of State could lie in the fact that s/he is under no obligation to accept the advice offered. Proposals may be rejected because of the inventions of considerations beyond the Committee's terms of reference, while the airing of ideas is likely to be beneficial, and demonstrate the Secretary of State's concern. Even if no recommendations are adopted, it may be that the Committee's work will stimulate a new policy in order to prevent some envisaged development." (Fowler, 1973:212).

2. These views are reflected in the two historical strands of teacher education and training. One strand had its origins in the 'craft tradition' of teacher training, designed to provide training for small numbers of students at no great economic cost. As late as 1960, teacher training was seen merely as a two year training with students receiving only a 'certificate'

at the end of their studies. The other strand held the belief that teachers were simply well educated people who required no training before they could set foot in a school. Teachers following this path normally possessed a 'degree' in a specialist subject, and were assumed capable of teaching the subject to a high standard. Later, this concept was modified with the development of 'postgraduate training'. As Hencke puts it, "The development of the two strands meant that there was no common ground for the training of teachers." (Hencke, 1977:8).

3. According to Warren's analysis, there were thirteen categories in the evidence presented to the Select Committee on Education and Science, as follows:

1. Precision was required in the formulation of the aims of the Colleges, the qualities required of teachers, the qualities required of students;

2. Research should be an integral part of the Colleges' work;

3. The opportunity to defer commitment to teaching should be available for those students who wished it, before deciding on their courses;

4. The atmosphere of the Colleges should change from the isolation of a 'mono-technic' mainly for non-graduates, and the Colleges should become fully integrated into higher education, preparing students for degrees making careers possible in various professions;

5. To help the students in their choice of career through delayed specialization courses should generally be 'consecutive', or modified forms of 'concurrency';

6. As a result of deferred commitment, the first part of the course should deal with academic work relevant to both prospective teachers and non-teachers. There should be more emphasis on, and a more practical approach to, the teaching of reading, the preparation of work with immigrants, and the preparation of teachers of science;

7. As a result of deferred commitment, the first part of the course should be concerned with main subjects and/or academic education, followed by further studies in these areas for non-teachers, and in practical education for prospective

teachers;

8. The movement towards specialization in the roles of the lecturing staff should be intensified since, at present, too many widely diverse tasks are required of the lecturers, with the resulting criticism that not all the tasks are performed efficiently by the same person;

9. The 'probationary year' should be made more significant; inservice work should be a regular part of a teacher's professional life;

10. There should be more consultation between the schools and the 'Colleges, with recognised specific areas of shared responsibilities, e.g. by the creation of 'teacher tutor' posts for teaching practice;

11. There should be much closer links between Colleges and Universities, with each partner on an equal footing. The Colleges should merge into a more flexible form of 'University', or 'Polyversity'.

12. There should be less closer links with the Local Education Authorities;

13. The control of the Department of Education and Science over the Colleges should be akin to that exercised over the Universities, i.e. through a 'Higher Education Grants Committee', or some such body. Similarly, a 'National Advisory Council', or a comparable body, should be set up to obtain advice for the Department of Education and Science, formally and openly, from the educational bodies. (Warren, 1971, and Warren, 1973).

4. Even before the official publication of the James Report, there had been a series of leaks as to its supposed contents. So authoritative were these leaks that it was generally believed that they had been inspired officially with the aim of testing public reaction to the proposed recommendations. As Ford put it, "There are some who believe that the James Report is an essential part of the Government's plan for the non-expansion of higher education proper, and that the present discussions, on the basis of leaks, will be held to have given interested parties sufficient opportunities for considering the entirely new policy". (Ford, 1971:5).

Also, NUT (October 1971), James: cause for concern; and NUT (November, 1971), James: the report of a meeting called to discuss the James Committee and its 'possible' recommendations.

5. According to Eggleston, "The real problems facing the James Committee and the Government were:

a) the real likelihood of an over large output of teachers from the Colleges of Education, given the continuance of the present pattern of teacher employment;

b) the rapid increase in the numbers of new university graduates, and in the proportion of graduates who wished to enter teaching;

c) the increased demand for places in higher education, and the need to find a more rapid way to provide them than had been achieved in the past decade". (Eggleston, 1972:v).

6. According to Lord James himself, however, sufficient evidence had already been published: "We have been blamed for not publishing the statistics and evidence but, in fact, we were helped enormously by having the evidence, i.e. we had a great mass of stuff from Edward Short's inquiry into the Area Training Organisations; there was also a considerable mass of verbatim evidence given to the parliamentary Select Committee inquiry, but never used; furthermore, the Associations which talked to us privately published their evidence." (Teacher, 12 May 1972).

#### REFERENCES

Armitage, P (1973), 'Planning in Practice: the work and legacy of the external committee', in: Fowler, G (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

AAM (1972), Teacher Education and Training.

AEC (1971), Memorandum of Evidence to the Teacher Training Inquiry.

AEC (1972), Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee: teacher education and training.

AMA (1972), Teacher Education and Training: the Association's comments on the James Report.

AHM (1971), Evidence Submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the Education and Initial Training of Teachers.

AHM (1972), Teacher Education and Training.

AMC (1971), Training of Teachers: memorandum by the Association.

ATCDE (1971), The Professional Education of Teachers: a memorandum submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the education and training of teachers.

ATCDE (1972), A Statement by the Executive Committee on Teacher Education and Training.

ATTI (1971), Evidence to the James Committee on Teacher Education.

ATTI (1972), Comments by the Executive Committee on the James Report.

AUT (1971), Submission to the Government's Inquiry into the Education and Initial Training of Teachers.

AUT (1972), Submission to the Secretary of State for Education and Science on the James Report.

Board of Education (1944), Teachers and Youth Leaders. (McNair Report). HMSO.

Boyle, E (1972), 'Ministers and Educational Reports'. Universities Quarterly, 27. 1, pp.3-10.

Burgess, T (1971), Dear Lord James: a critique of teacher education. Penguin.

Chapman, R A (1973), The Role of Commissions in Policy Making. Allen & Unwin.

CDP (1972), Statement of Views upon the Report on Teacher Education and Training.

CVCP (1972), Preliminary Statement on the Report - 'Teacher Education and Training'.

Conservative Party (1970), Better Education. Conservative Party. (Party Manifesto).

Corbett, A (1973), Much to Do About Education. Campaign for Educational Advance.

DES (1966), Government of the Colleges of Education: Report of the Study Group under the Chairmanship of T R Weaver. (Weaver Report). HMSO.

DES (1970), A Teaching Council for England and Wales: Report of the Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science. (Weaver Report). HMSO.

DES (1972), Teacher Education and Training: a Report of a Committee of Inquiry under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. (James Report). HMSO.

DES (1972), Education: a Framework for Expansion. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 5174).

Education Act (1944), An Act to Reform the Law Relating to Education in England and Wales. HMSO.

Eggleston, J (1972), 'Teacher Education after the James Report'. Secondary Education, 3. 1, pp. v-vi.

Ford, B (1971), 'Trinary Forebodings'. Universities Quarterly, 26. 1, pp.3-5.

Ford, B (1972), 'Report on James'. Universities Quarterly, 26. 2, pp.127-163.

Fowler, G (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

Harding, H A (1978), 'Harding Replies to Hencke over College Closures'. Education, 29 December 1978; and Education, 5 January 1979.

HMA-HMC (1972), Report of a Working Party on Teacher Training.

HMA-HMC (1972), Our Schools and the Preparation of Teachers.

Hencke, D (1977), 'The Government and College Reorganisation'. Higher Education Review, 9. 3, pp. 7-18.

Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorgansiation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.

HM Treasury (1972), Public Expenditure, 1971-76. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 5178).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), Teacher Training. HMSO. (HC 182).

ILEA (1971), The Training of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee of Inquiry into teacher training. (Appendix to the Report of the Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee to the Education Committee, 12 May 1971).

ILEA (1972), Teacher Education and Training: Observations on the James Committee Report. (Joint Report of the Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee and the Schools Sub-Committee).

Joint Four Associations (1971), Evidence to the James Committee

on Teacher Training.

Kogan, M (1971), *The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan*. Penguin.

Kogan, M (1973), 'The Plowden Committee on Primary Education', in: Chapman, R A (1973), *The Role of Commissions in Policy Making*. Allen & Unwin.

Kogan, M (1973), 'The Function of the Central Advisory Council in Educational Change', in: Fowler, G (1973), *Decision Making in British Education*. Heinemann.

Kogan, M and Packwood, T (1974), *Advisory Councils and Committees in Education*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Labour Party (1970), *Education and Social Equality*. Labour Party. (Party Manifesto).

Logan, D (1972), 'Reactions to the James Report'. *Secondary Education*, 2. 3, pp. 23-26.

Lomax, D E (1973), *The Education of Teachers in Britain*. Wiley.

McConnell, T R and Fry, M A (1972), 'Flexibility or Rigidity: university attitudes to the James Report'. *Higher Education Review*, 4. 3, pp. 13-29.

NUS (1971), *The Education and Training of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee*.

NUS (1972), *Teacher Education after James*.

NUT (1971), *The Reform of Teacher Education: a policy statement on the future of teacher education*.

NUT (October 1971), *James: cause for concern*.

NUT (November 1971), *James: the report of a meeting called by the NUT to discuss the James Committee and its possible recommendations*.

NUT (February 1972), *James: a critical appraisal. (An Executive Statement on the James Report on Teacher Education)*.

NUT (December 1972), *Executive Statement on the Reform of Teacher Education*.

Parry, J P (1972), *The Lord James Tricycle: some notes on 'Teacher Education and Training'*. Allen & Unwin.

Pile, W (1979), *The Department of Education and Science*. Allen & Unwin.

SCHDEP (1971), *Evidence to the James Committee*.

Taylor, G and Saunders, J B (1976), *The New Law of Education*. Butterworths.



UCET (1971), The Education of Teachers - Looking to the Future: evidence to the Committee of Inquiry into teacher education.

UCET (1972), Interim Statement on the James Report.

UCET (1972), UCET on James.

UCET (1972), Alternatives to James.

ULIE (1971), An Inquiry into the Education and Training of Teachers in the Area of the Institute, 1970-71. (ATO Review).

ULIE (1971), The Context of Reform in the Education and Training of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee.

ULIE (1972), The Education and Training of Teachers: a statement by the Council of the Institute on the James Report.

Warren, C F (1971), Teacher Training: a consideration of the parliamentary Select Committee on Education and Science, 1969-70, and its work, with an examination of those factors in the education of teachers abstracted from the material which it produced. University of Lancaster Department of Educational Research. (Unpublished MA Dissertation).

Warren, C F (1973), 'The Evidence for James'. Education for Teaching, 90, pp. 37-45.

Weaver, T R (1979), Department of Education and Science: central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Wheare, K C (1955), Government by Committee: an essay on the British Constitution. Oxford University Press.

Willey, F T and Maddison, R E (1971), An Inquiry into Teacher Training. University of London Press.

Williams, G (1972), 'The Costs of the James Report.' Times Higher Educational Supplement, 24 March 1972.

Chapter 7. THE 1972 WHITE PAPER - 'EDUCATION: A FRAMEWORK FOR EXPANSION': A Policy for the Contraction of Teacher Education and Training.

The Government's long awaited White Paper, 'Education; a framework for expansion', was published on Wednesday 6 December 1972. (DES, 1972, White Paper). It was hailed as the first real examination of educational strategy, and the most comprehensive review of the educational system, since the 1944 Education Act. (Financial Times, 7 December 1972 and Times Higher Education Supplement, 8 December 1972). Certainly, its format and language marked the White Paper out as being different from all the other policy statements on education issued by the Government in the previous fifteen to twenty years.

First, the 1972 White Paper aimed to set out a policy for education for the next ten years: "The last ten years have seen a major expansion of the education service. The next ten years will see expansion continue, as it must if education is to make its full contribution to the vitality of our society and our economy." (White Paper, 1972:1). Second, the 1972 White Paper dealt with several areas of education all at once, unlike the reports of Advisory Committees and Committees of Inquiry which, during the previous decade, had dealt with one aspect of education at a time. As Fowler puts it, "Whereas the Advisory Committees of the early and mid-1960s tended to investigate specific and separate problems, such as nursery or higher education, the work being undertaken more recently by the Department of Education and Science in the late 1960s and early

1970s has included 'programmes' encompassing the educational system as a whole. The DES, therefore, seems to be moving away from its fragmented approach to planning towards a more comprehensive approach, involving the consideration of alternative 'policy options' within a general framework." (Fowler, 1973:285).

In particular, the 1972 White Paper provided a 'framework for expansion' in five areas of education, three of which were of direct relevance to teacher education, training and supply - nursery education, staffing standards in schools and teacher education and training itself. According to the White Paper, "The teaching force will continue to expand, but no less - and perhaps more importantly - the teacher training programme envisages a major new initiative to improve the quality of training, and thus of the teaching force." (White Paper, 1972:1).

Many of the proposals for improving the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training put set out in the 1972 White Paper were obviously inspired by the James Report. Indeed, according to Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science, the White Paper owed a great deal to the recommendations of the James Report. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 2 March 1973). At first sight, the Government 'responded' whole-heartedly to the recommendations of the James Report: "The six objectives at which the James Committee aimed have received universal acclaim, and they are fully accepted by the Government". (White Paper, 1972:16).

Closer examination, however, reveals that it was the principles which were accepted - not the details. As the White Paper itself put it, "The methods by which the James Committee proposed that some (of the objectives) should be achieved have proved more controversial." (White Paper, 1972:17).

According to the 1972 White Paper, the six 'objectives' laid down by the James Report for improving the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training were as follows:

1. a large and systematic expansion of 'in-service education and training';
2. a planned reinforcement of 'induction' in the first year in school;
3. the progressive achievement of an 'all-graduate' teaching profession by means of a more flexible, open-ended and changing pattern of courses, without loss of emphasis on the development of professional skills:
4. the improved education and training of teachers for further education; (CONTENT)
5. the whole-hearted acceptance of the Colleges of Education into the family of higher education;
6. the improved arrangements for the control and coordination of teacher education, training and supply. (CONTROL). (White Paper, 1972:16).

### Teacher Education and Training: 'Content'

The 1972 White Paper began its section on teacher education and training, like the James Report before it, with the non-controversial issue of 'in-service education and training'. The James Report had recommended that there should be adequate provision for the in-service education and training of teachers throughout their careers, with all teachers being entitled to release for one term in every seven years, in the first instance. The 1972 White Paper accepted this recommendation. (White Paper, 1972:18). However, the White Paper did foresee certain practical difficulties in this recommendation, since it would need to be implemented over a period of time as the increase in the teaching force permitted large numbers of teachers to be released. There were also the further practical difficulties of making an express entitlement to in-service education and training a matter of contract between a teacher and his/her employer. (White Paper, 1972:18).

There is, in fact, strong evidence to suggest that Ministers and Civil Servants in the Department of Education and Science had shared a common philosophy about in-service education and training for years, but they had not been prepared to accord it a high priority within total educational expenditure. However, by the end of the Labour Government's term of office, in 1970, that priority had become greater. According to Gerry Fowler, former Minister of State for Education and Science, while addressing the Annual Conference of the UCET, in 1969, "Most people concerned with the training of teachers now seem

convinced that inservice education and training must be accorded a higher priority than we have hitherto been able to give it". (Fowler, 1974:37).

The James Report had also recommended that a teacher on his/her first employment should be released part-time to profit from a systematic programme of 'induction'. This recommendation the 1972 White Paper accepted. (White Paper, 1972:19). The White Paper, like the James Report, also wanted to see the teaching profession itself play a major role in the induction process, and accepted the recommendation of the James Report for 'professional tutors'. (White Paper, 1972:19). Again, there were practical problems, and the White Paper proposed the setting up of 'pilot schemes' in four areas, with the aim of producing a 'national scheme' in the school year 1975-76. (White Paper, 1972:20).(1)

The James Report recommended the creation of an 'all-graduate' profession. This the 1972 White Paper accepted. (White Paper, 1972:21). However, the James Report had recommended that this should be achieved by awarding student teachers a BA(Ed) degree after they had successfully completed two years of academic 'education', followed by two years of professional 'training'. This recommendation the 1972 White Paper did not accept, doubting the value of a 'degree' composed of three elements for which there might be no common standards, or common responsibility. Instead, the White Paper proposed the creation of new courses incorporating educational studies, which would be so designed that they would lead both to the award of a BED degree and to qualified teacher status. (White Paper, 1972:21). The normal entry requirements would be the same as for the Universities, and such 'concurrent' degrees in education would include at least fifteen weeks of teaching practice in schools, rather than the four weeks recommended by the James Report. (White Paper, 1972:19).

The James Report had also recommended the creation of a new 'Diploma in Higher Education' (DipHE), designed for use in a teacher education and training context. The 1972 White Paper accepted the creation of a DipHE - but as a two year course of higher education in a wider context, and with a wider purpose. As the White Paper expressed it, "The Government welcomes the James Committee's recognition of the potential of two year courses, but the proposals which follow are designed to serve a wider purpose than that envisaged in the James Report." (White Paper, 1972:32). According to the White Paper, the new two year

courses leading to the DipHE would have certain characteristics as regards 'standards, availability, acceptability, credit, validation and awards.' Again, the normal entry requirements would be the same as for Universities.

Hencke has criticised the Government and Department of Education and Science for their rejection of what he regards as the 'pillars' of the James Report, namely the linking of induction to initial training in the BA(Ed) degree, and the close identification of teacher education and training with the DipHE. (Hencke, 1978:48). Yet, as this thesis has already revealed, the recommendations of the James Report had aroused strong opposition from the education lobby and were, by general agreement, rejected by the Government and the DES. As Hugh Harding, former Assistant (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, puts it, "All the advice we received was to the effect that the prospects for the DipHE were already damaged by the James Report, which gave the image of a qualification subordinate to a new and curious degree for the teaching profession. It was urged that its acceptance depended on its being launched in the widest possible context. It was clearly unwise to make new teacher education and training courses too dependent on a qualification about which there were general doubts. In the new BEd degree, therefore, it was an optional extra. (Moreover), the isolation of teacher education and training in a third sector of higher education was one of the major criticisms of the existing system. The James Report required its continuance mainly because of the BA(Ed) degree. Academic - if not professional considerations - indicated,



however, that the teaching profession would benefit from integration of teacher education and training with higher education more generally." (Education, 29 December 1978).

Hencke also implies that, if the James Committee had been allowed to publish certain facts and figures, the opposition to the above recommendations would have been lessened, if not removed. There is, however, no real evidence for this view: about the required status and content of teacher education and training there was, as this thesis has already revealed, little disagreement.

Finally, with regard to the 'content' of teacher education and training, as outlined by the 1972 White Paper, there was the issue of improved education and training for further education teachers. The James Report had recommended that a much greater proportion of those teaching in further education should receive initial training, and that they should have opportunities for inservice education and training in their careers. This recommendation the 1972 White Paper accepted. (White Paper, 1972:24).

From the above account of the proposed 'content' of teacher education and training, it is clear that the 1972 White Paper, although it accepted many of the recommendations of the James Report in principle, it did so with certain qualifications and amendments. From the evidence available, the White Paper paid considerable attention to the reactions produced by the James Report, and - following discussions and consultations with the

various pressure groups and partisans - took many of them into account in formulating policy for the education and training of teachers. As the White Paper itself put it, "The Secretary of State has discussed the recommendations of the James Report fully and constructively with all the main bodies concerned. The debate which followed has been of great value. The Secretary of State's discussions could not have hoped to achieve complete unanimity over so wide a range of interlocking problems, but they have established a large measure of common agreement on the best way of achieving the main objectives. The Government believes that the decisions which follow form an acceptable basis for sharing responsibility for the preparation of teachers with the Government's main partners - the teachers themselves, the institutions concerned with education and training, and the Local Education Authorities and Voluntary Bodies." (White Paper, 1972:17).

### Teacher Education and Training: 'Control'.

With regard to the 'control' of teacher education and training, as outlined in objectives 5 and 6 of the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', the James Report had recommended that a new awarding body - the 'National Council for Teacher Education and Training' (NCTET) - should be set up, to validate both the DipHE and the BA(Ed) degree. The 1972 White Paper did not accept this recommendation but proposed, instead, that both the DipHE and BA(Ed) degree should be subject to validation by existing awarding bodies, i.e. the Universities and the CNAA. (White Paper, 1972:21, 26 & 33). In this the White Paper agreed with the 'Note of Extension' in the James Report, which had recommended that the whole of the academic awarding functions should go to the Universities or the CNAA.

However, on the issue of closer links with the Universities as a whole, the 1972 White Paper did accept the recommendation of the James Report that such links should not be extended. Indeed, the White Paper emphasised that it was Government policy - consistent since the Robbins Report of 1963 - to oppose any amalgamations of Colleges of Education with Universities. (White Paper, 1972:44). From the evidence available, it is clear that the 'whole-hearted acceptance of the Colleges of Education into the family of higher education' meant, in fact, the acceptance of the Colleges of Education into the 'public sector' of higher education. As the White Paper itself put it, "The logic of the conclusions recorded in

this White Paper is that the substantial broadening of function proposed for the great majority of Colleges of Education will involve their much closer assimilation into the rest of the 'non-university' public sector of further and higher education. Put another way, a College which expands and diversifies, either alone or by joining forces with a sister college, or a further education college, enlarging the range of its courses and extending its clientele, will not easily be distinguishable by function from a Polytechnic or other Further Education College". (White Paper, 1972:46). In short, the separate development of higher education, as begun by the 'binary policy' of 1966, was to continue.

Similarly, in the case of the 'coordination' of teacher education and training, although the Universities were to continue to validate awards, they were no longer to exercise a coordinating function for initial and inservice education and training in their region. This regional responsibility for the coordination of teacher education and training had since 1944, rested with the 'Area Training Organisations', on which the Universities, Colleges of Education, Local Education Authorities and Teachers' Associations had been represented. The James Report had recommended the setting up of new regional machinery to carry out this coordinating function - the 'Regional Councils for Colleges and Departments of Education' (RCCDEs). The 1972 White Paper, accepting that new regional machinery was necessary, proposed the establishment of new 'Regional Committees' to coordinate the education and training of teachers, replacing the existing university based Area

Training Organisations. However, the proposed 'Regional Coordinating Committees for Teacher Training' would not have executive or financial responsibility for the services they were to coordinate - this would remain with the Local Education Authorities. (White Paper, 1972:27). This was contrary to the recommendation of the James Report, but in keeping with previous government policy. As Regan points out, "Local Education Authority 'control' of the Colleges of Education is convenient for the Government. If they were all incorporated into the autonomous university sector, and achieved the status and prestige of Universities, they would be far less amenable to government pressure." (Regan, 1977:163).

Finally, with regard to the 'control' of teacher education and training, there remained - in the words of the 1972 White Paper, the machinery by which the Secretary of State for Education and Science could, "Best obtain the 'advice' of the Local Education Authorities and other providing bodies, the teaching profession and the institutions themselves on the discharge of his central responsibilities for teacher supply and training." (White Paper, 1972:27). The James Report had recommended that this should be a function of the 'National Council for Teacher Education and Training' (NCTET). This the 1972 White Paper did not accept. Instead, the Government chose to accept the recommendation on this issue of a departmental Working Party, under the chairmanship of Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science, which had reported in 1970. According to the Weaver Report, "The primary function of the new body would be to

advise the Secretary of State and the Department of Education and Science on policy matters referred by him connected with the supply and training of teachers for maintained schools and establishments of further education in England and Wales". (Weaver Report, 1970:4). This the White Paper accepted, and proposed the setting up of an 'Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers' (ACSTT), on the model recommended by the Weaver Report. (White Paper, 1972:27). The issue of a 'General Teaching Council', to oversee the professional aspects of teacher education and training, which had also been discussed in the Weaver Report, was left in abeyance for the time being.

From the evidence available, it is clear that the Government and the Department of Education and Science, in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', was unwilling to accept the NCTET or RCCDEs as recommended by the James Report. The 'control' of teacher education and training, at both regional and national level, was to be kept firmly in the hands of the Government and DES. No 'external' Advisory Committee was to be allowed to put forward policies which might be contrary to those of the Government. In the case of the new 'Advisory Committee for the Supply and Training of Teachers', there was to be a Chairman appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, and twenty members appointed by the Secretary of State on the nomination of the various organisations representing the Local Education Authorities, the Voluntary Bodies and the Teachers' Associations. In addition, there were to be three Assessors, all Civil Servants from the

Department of Education and Science.(2) Margaret Thatcher, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, later declared that she reserved the right to control the agenda of the ACSTT, and to decide whether to accept, or reject, its suggestions as to what it might inquire into. (Times Educational Supplement, 6 July, 1973). In fact, consultations about teacher education, training and supply 'after the event' were to be a marked feature of the relationship between the Department of Education and Science and its new Advisory Committee.

Moreover, the evidence suggests that, in setting up the new Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers, there was to be no repetition of the problems caused by the previous 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers' (NACTST). As this thesis has already examined, the shortages in teacher supply in the late 1950s and early 1960s had led the Government to devote the attention of the NACTST to the issue of teacher 'supply'. In so doing, the NACTST departed completely from its former discussions on issues of departmental administration. It entered a sphere of policy making with greater political and economic implications than that with which it had previously been concerned, and it moved - for the first time - into the realm of major national policy. As the James Report put it, "The NACTST found itself advising on matters which fell solely within the discretion and responsibilities of the Government and Department of Education and Science and was, thus, taking decisions that were essentially 'political'". (James Report, 1972:57).

In short, in turning its attention to the issue of total teacher supply, the NACTST was trespassing upon a policy making function which the Department of Education and Science by now regarded strictly as its own prerogative. The DES might allow consultation and discussion about the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training - but not 'supply'. According to Sir Herbert Andrew, former Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, it was the DES which not only controlled the 'supply' of teachers in the education system, it could exercise such control without consultation with the interested pressure groups and partisans. (Select Committee, 1970:426). The evidence confirms, as will be examined later in this thesis, that the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', intended that the control of teacher supply by the Department of Education and Science should continue.



### Teacher Education and Training: 'Supply'.

Throughout this thesis there has been the stated hypothesis that the Government, in setting up the James Committee, was concerned not only with the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, but also equally - if not more - concerned with the whole issue of teacher supply, numbers and costs. (Weaver, 1979:66). As Miller puts it, "The James Committee was set up to fulfil a promise made at an Election. The reason for this promise was the adverse criticism of the education and training of teachers which had developed during the previous five years. Perhaps, also, the James Committee was set up to answer the other questions not mentioned in the terms of reference - how to find a way of providing higher education for the expected growing 'number' of candidates who will have at least two 'A' Level examination qualifications, and this at a 'cost' that the nation can afford." (Miller, 1972:31).

Equally, at the back of the minds of the James Committee was not only the problem of how to deal with the great increase in the number of qualified students for places in higher education, and the accompanying costs of giving such a higher education to as large a proportion of the population as previously, there was also the problem of how to reduce the increasing 'supply' of teachers. As the James Report itself expressed it, "To put it bluntly, the 'supply' of new teachers is now increasing so rapidly that it must soon catch up with any likely assessment of future demand, and choices will have to be made very soon between various ways of using, or

diverting, some of the resources at present invested in the education and training of teachers." (James Report, 1972:75). Yet, as this thesis has already revealed, little or no mention was made of 'quantity' in the James Report. On the face of it, the James Report was only concerned with the 'quality' of teacher education and training. However, even if the James Report was unwilling, or unable, to reveal its true purpose, the 1972 White Paper displayed no such reluctance: "It is on matters of scale, organisation and cost, rather than educational content, that attention is mainly focused in this White Paper." (White Paper, 1972:1). Nearly half the White Paper is taken up with 'numbers' and 'costs' in higher education.

The increase in the number of students entering higher education was one of the main reasons for the setting up of the James Committee. Student numbers in England and Wales had risen greatly during the 1960s - in the Universities from 102,000 to 230,000; in Polytechnics and other Colleges of Advanced Further Education from 24,000 to 103,000; and in Colleges and Departments of Education from 36,000 to 114,000. (Table 2). A 'Planning Paper', published by the Department of Education and Science in 1970 - the last official public projection of the demand for places in higher education before the 1972 White Paper - had forecast that student numbers would double to at least 600,000 by 1976, and to 835,000 by 1981, which was itself a forecast 48% above that of the Robbins Report. According to the same Planning Paper, the 'costs' of higher education would increase from 590 million pounds in 1970, to 700 million in

1977, and 980 million in 1980. (DES, 1970, Planning Paper, 2). The 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', reduced the student numbers in higher education to 750,000, and adopted it as the basis for the Government's long term policy for higher education. (White Paper, 1972:35).

According to the 1972 White Paper, the reduction in student numbers would be at the expense of the Universities and the Colleges of Education. The majority of the 750,000 students would be provided by the Polytechnics and other Colleges of Advanced Further Education, with student numbers in the Polytechnics being increased from 80,000 in 1970 to 180,000 by 1981. (White Paper, 1972:41). The Universities would provide 375,000 students by 1981. (White Paper, 1972:38). The Colleges and Departments of Education, however, would face an absolute decline in student numbers from 114,000 in 1971, to 75,000/85,000 in 1981. (White Paper, 1972:44).

In 1963 the number of qualified teachers in England and Wales had been 277,000. In 1971 this number had risen to 346,000. (Table 3). According to the 1972 White Paper, there would be a need for 510,000 qualified teachers by 1981. (White Paper, 1972:15 & 43). This figure would be made up of three elements:

1. 25,000 would be needed to meet the planned expansion of nursery education;
2. 20,000 would be needed to cover the release of teachers for inservice education and training, and to cover probationary teachers undertaking additional training during their induction

period;

3. 465,000 would be needed to staff the maintained primary and secondary schools - a figure which would represent a teaching force 10% above that needed to maintain the staffing standards reached in 1971. (White Paper, 1972:14).

Nevertheless, the implication of 510,000 teachers by 1981 was that the average net growth of teacher numbers by 18,000/20,000 a year would not need to continue indefinitely, and there would soon need to be a 'contraction' in the number of student teachers admitted to courses of teacher education and training. Hence, the forecast in the 1972 White Paper of a need for only 75,000/85,000 student places in Colleges and Departments of Education by 1981. (White Paper, 1972:43).

#### THE 1972 WHITE PAPER: IMPLEMENTATION.

Following the publication of the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' the Government set about implementing its policy for the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training: "A national development plan for Colleges of Education and Polytechnics during the next decade is being drawn up by the Department of Education and Science. Local Education Authorities will shortly be receiving a 'discussion document' setting out the DES' early ideas, coupled with a request that they consider the role of the Polytechnics, Colleges of Education and other Colleges, i.e. those in the 'public sector'. One implicit theme of the exercise, which will probably last through 1973, is the

elimination of the 'binary barrier' dividing the Colleges of Education from the other Colleges in the field of Advanced Further Education". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 12 January 1973).

In March 1973, this 'discussion document' was issued by the Department of Education and Science, in the form of a draft Circular. The draft Circular encouraged Colleges of Education to merge with Polytechnics, or to establish new 'poly-technic' institutions of their own. The Circular favoured the 'public sector' of higher education, rather than encouraging an expansion of teacher education and training in the autonomous 'university sector'. The Circular also stated very firmly that it did not want teacher education and training to be university based, and gave the distinct impression that it wanted to sever the 'university connection'. The Area Training Organisations were to be abolished, to be replaced by new 'Teacher Training Committees' - which would not necessarily be centred on any University. The new Teacher Training Committees would be financed centrally by the Government, but would not have executive powers or financial responsibility for the services they provided, merely 'coordinating' the education and training of teachers in their region. The Universities would still have the power to validate courses of teacher education and training, but Colleges of Education would also be able to apply to the CNAA for validation. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 9 March 1973 & 16 March 1973).

The full Circular, 'Development of Higher Education, in the

Non-University Sector', was issued by the Department of Education and Science on 26 March 1973. (DES, Circular 7/73). It contents had already been foreshadowed by the draft Circular issued earlier in the month. The Circular now gave the existing Local Education Authorities until November 1973 to propose interim plans for the development of higher education in the 'public sector', and the reorganisation of the Polytechnics and Colleges of Education in their area. Following Local Government Reorganisation, the new Local Education Authorities were to submit final proposals as soon as possible after 1 April 1974. (DES, Circular 7/73:para.8).

In its Circular the Department of Education and Science gave guidance to the Local Education Authorities about what the Government regarded as the future role of the Colleges of Education: "What is called for is a major reconstruction of the future role of Colleges of Education, both inside and outside teacher education and training, their relation with Universities and Polytechnics and other institutions of further education offering advanced courses". (DES, Circular 7/73: para.4). According to the DES Circular, many Colleges of Education, instead of concerning themselves solely with the education and training of teachers, would - in future - be called upon to play a wider role, sometimes alone, but more often in association (i.e. merging) with Polytechnics, other Colleges of Education or other Colleges of Advanced Further Education. (DES, Circular 7/73: para.17). This policy had only been hinted at in the Robbins Report, but had been clearly envisaged by the 'binary policy' of 1966.

In Circular 7/73 the Department of Education and Science also reminded Local Education Authorities of the three 'planning criteria' with regard to institutions of higher education, contained in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion':

a) the need for institutions to achieve a minimum size to obtain full economies of scale;

b) the need to avoid further concentrations of very large numbers of students on a scale which would present acute problems of residence and transport;

c) the need, wherever possible, to make provision within reach of their own homes for both full and part-time students. (DES, Circular, 7/73: para.9).

The Department of Education and Science also expressed the hope that it would be possible in their planning for the Local Education Authorities to take greater account of the last two criteria, and to relate the distribution of higher education more closely to population. In the words of the Circular, "In the long term every major conurbation, or other catchment area, with a population of more than a quarter of a million might expect to achieve an institution offering higher education courses, including teacher education". (DES, Circular 7/73: para.12).

Finally, in its Circular, the Department of Education and Science foresaw a sharp 'contraction' in the number of student

teachers: "It is expected that the number of full-time students on initial training courses will be reduced from 114,000 to 60,000/70,000. The number of full-time students following teacher training courses - both initial and inservice - will, therefore, fall by some 40,000/50,000". (DES, Circular, 7/73: para.3). The Department of Education and Science foresaw that some Colleges of Education might have to close - but, as yet, the total number of teachers in training remained as set out in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'. (DES, Circular, 7/73: para.17). The DES promised to consult later in the year about more detailed projections of teacher numbers required to meet the policy outlined in the 1972 White Paper but, in the meantime, it was suggested that the Local Education Authorities should work on the assumption that 65,000 places would be required in 1981 for initial teacher education and training, and a further 15,000 for inservice training. However, there was a warning that the projections would need to be revised periodically in the light of experience and 'demographic trends'. (DES, Circular 7/73: para.14).

According to Hencke, DES Circular 7/73, like the White Paper which preceeded it, was one of the major post-war educational documents: "It is another harbinger of the new era of austerity and 'rationalization' that now confronts the Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges. At one swoop it introduces direct intervention in local planning by central Government, a policy of the regions, a vast reorganisation of the 'public sector' of higher education and, by emphasising that more students must attend a local college, takes a significant step away from the



national institutions of higher education". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 6 April 1973). There is strong evidence to suggest that the latter had been in the minds of the policy makers at the Department of Education and Science for some time. More 'home based' students had been one of the thirteen points put forward to University Vice Chancellors, by Shirley Williams, Minister of State at the Department of Education and Science, in September 1969. This view had been publicly supported by Margaret Thatcher, the current Secretary of State for Education and Science, as late as January 1973. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 5 January 1973). Others of the 'thirteen points' were also to influence policy for the education, training and supply of teachers as outlined in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion' - as this thesis will examine later.

## THE 1972 WHITE PAPER: REACTIONS.

With the publication of Circular 7/73 by the Department of Education and Science, doubts began to be raised, and questions to be asked, about the accuracy of the teacher 'supply' forecasts set out in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', and repeated in DES Circular 7/73. The projected teacher numbers were crucial to the future of the Colleges of Education, and the Government was pressed to reveal the calculations upon which its policy was based, both by the Colleges of Education themselves and by the Teachers' Associations. (Drake, 1974). There was a general view that the 1972 White Paper would have been more valuable if it had revealed details of the calculations upon which its policy for teacher supply had been based, had explained the implications of this policy with greater candour, and had spelt out the mechanisms by which it might be achieved. The Government, however, persistently refused to reveal its calculations. As one commentator put it, "It is easier to get information on germ warfare from the Ministry of Defence than to find out the future of Colleges of Education from the Department of Education and Science". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 23 March 1973).

The Government argued that its figures were based on the projected school population of 9.45 million children in 1981. On the basis of actual staffing standards in 1971, the Government estimated that there would be a need for 420,000 teachers in this year. To this figure was added an additional

45,000 teachers to cover a 10% improvement factor, plus 25,000 teachers for the nursery education programme, and 20,000 teachers to cover inservice education and training - making a total teaching force of 510,000. (White Paper, 1972:43). According to the Government, the whole programme would require an additional 146,000 teachers by 1981: 40,000 had already been provided - hence the need to 'contract' teacher supply, so that only 106,000 additional teachers would be required.

In April 1973, in a debate in Parliament, Norman St John Stevas, Parliamentary (Under) Secretary of State for Education and Science, denied that the Department of Education and Science had failed to provide adequate statistics and accurate forecasts of teacher supply: "The components of the 510,000 target figure for teachers has not changed substantially since the publication of the 1972 White Paper. It is now projected that the total maintained school population by the end of the decade will be 9.45 million. The output of newly trained teachers is projected to fall from about 45,000 in 1975, to about 42,000 in 1976, and to about 34,000 by 1981. The output of trained graduates is expected to increase to 18,000 by 1981, when the output of non-graduates and three year BEd graduates is expected to fall to 12,000. The output of four year BEd graduates is expected to level off at about 4,500 by the end of the decade. The re-entry of former teachers, mainly married women returners, will increase from about 14,000 in 1973 to about 18,000 by the end of the decade". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 13 April 1973).

According to Norman St John Stevas, the above projections pointed to a total recruitment of about 50,000 teachers a year by the end of the decade. However, he did admit that any projections of school population, or teacher supply, more than a few years ahead were obviously uncertain, not only because all extrapolations into the future were uncertain, but also because estimates of school population more than five years ahead were inevitably dependent on the birth-rate. In his own words, "Provided that the birth-rate behaves as the statisticians expect in the next ten years, it is hoped to lead to an improvement in the pupil:teacher ratio from its present level of 1:22.6 to 1:18.5 in 1981". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 13 April 1973).

However, as Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science, pointed out, "The future cannot, by definition, be known with certainty. Even the most sophisticated statistics depend on a whole host of assumptions about how people will behave, and how the events will turn out in the future - the future size of the school population, the number of additional teachers needed to produce a given pupil:teacher ratio, or the number of students of a given calibre who may wish to take a higher education course year by year in the future. It is easy to be wise after the event. You make the best assumptions you can and, while hoping for the most favourable outcome, plan against the worst". (Weaver, 1979:57). Even in June 1973, Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science, was already warning that the target for teacher 'supply' set out in the

1972 White Paper was affected by two unpredictable factors - the 'birth-rate' and the teacher 'wastage rate'. The number of births in 1972 had fallen short of the forecast by 40,000 children, and preliminary returns for 1973 were already suggesting that the birth-rate was still falling: "It seems virtually certain, therefore, that subsequent revisions of the projected pupil numbers - and, therefore, projected teacher numbers - will have to reflect the downward demographic trend". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 1 June 1973).

As this thesis has already examined, forecasts of teacher 'supply' have not always been accurate and, on occasions, have been conspicuously inaccurate. While some attempt at forecasting teacher supply is necessary, if only because what is done now will have its effect in ten or fifteen years time, the evidence suggests that the longer the time span, the greater the risk of inaccuracy. As Ahamad and Blaug put it, "Forecasting errors tend to be greater the longer the time horizon of the forecast. The attempt to forecast the 'demand' and 'supply' of teachers in England and Wales suggests that forecasting errors increase only slowly over the first two years, but then accelerate as the time horizon lengthens". (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:312).

According to Ahamad and Blaug, short-term forecasts, two or three years ahead, were sometimes fairly accurate, but they were not particularly useful for educational purposes, which obviously needed long-term forecasts. In their view, manpower patterns could not be predicted 'ten years' ahead with the

degree of accuracy required by policy makers in the field of education. (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:322). Yet, this is just what the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', claimed to be doing: "The last ten years have seen a major expansion of the education service. The 'next ten years' will see the expansion continue, as it must if education is to make its full contribution to the vitality of our society, and our economy". (White Paper, 1972:1).

The evidence suggests that, if long-term forecasts of teacher supply are to be made, less time should be devoted to producing 'single value forecasts', and more time devoted to studying the causes of teacher recruitment and wastage, and the 'sensitivity' of teacher demand and supply to alternative assumptions about school population and pupil:teacher ratios. (Ahamad and Blaug, 1973:315). Again, this is what the 1972 White Paper failed to do, when it forecast the need for a force of 510,000 teachers by 1981. Considerable variations in the supply of teachers set out in the 1972 White Paper would have taken place if variables - such as teacher wastage rates or population changes, had been taken into account. For example, if the supply of teachers planned for 1981 was 510,000, it would have provided a maximum class size of 40 pupils in primary schools, and 30 in secondary. However, if there had been changes in the estimates by the Department of Education and Science, the figure could have been as high as 520,000 or as low as 497,000. If the same criteria had been applied to class sizes of 30 in both primary and secondary, there would have been a need for 576,000 teachers by 1981 or, if variables had

been taken into account, a high figure of 594,000, or a low one of 559,000. (Morris, Ryba and Drake, 1973:47).

Although the Department of Education and Science attempted to justify and explain the assumptions which lay behind its figure of 510,000 teachers by 1981, there was a general consensus that a policy decision had been made on purely 'political' and 'economic' grounds.(3) There was a general belief that the DES had chosen the figure of 510,000 teachers as a matter of 'policy' rather than being presented with an arbitrary figure by the statisticians as a result of single-value forecasting techniques. The figure of 480,000 or 570,000 could have been chosen just as equally: briefing by DES Civil Servants was available for other figures. (DES, 1973, Reports on Education, 78).

One of the stated hypotheses of this thesis is that all the debates, discussions and controversies about the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education, training and supply between 1963 and 1973 were in reality dominated by Government economic policy and the search for economic efficiency, and by the question of resources and costs in higher education as a whole. The James Report, in spite of its apparent emphasis on the reform of the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training was to a very large extent a 'camouflage' to conceal the Government's real concern, namely how to secure a 'contraction' in the over-all student population and - as a result of the impending surplus in the 'supply' of teachers - to diversify the 'mono-technic' nature of Colleges of

Education.

As early as January 1969, there had been proposals to limit 'numbers' and 'costs' in higher education, proposals first suggested in the 'thirteen point' discussion paper sent to the University Vice Chancellors by the then Minister of State for Education and Science, Shirley Williams. Of these thirteen points, the two most important were the proposals for 'two year sub-degree courses of higher education' and 'the need to make greater use of the Colleges of Education'. (Times Education Supplement, 17 January 1969). Support gradually built up within the Department of Education and Science, as will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis, for a 'rationalization' of higher education, which might include two year sub-degree courses in Colleges of Education, Polytechnics and Universities, possibly on a local basis, which for some students would lead to employment, and for others to another two years of degree study in a University or Polytechnic, or to various forms of professional training, of which preparation for teaching might be one. (Times Educational Supplement, 29 May 1970).

The main evidence for this view is the recommendation of the James Report for the DipHE - to be followed, in the case of teachers, by two years of professional training. The DipHE, proposed by the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', would without doubt have cut 'costs' and limited 'numbers' in higher education. As the White Paper itself expressed it, "The introduction and general adoption of new



courses leading to a Diploma in Higher Education would enable many students to achieve in two years, instead of three or more, as much higher education as they aspire to between school and first employment. They would also make a contribution to easing the financial burden the expansion will impose". (White Paper, 1972:36). Finally, the proposed two 'A' Level entry requirement for both degrees and the DipHE would inevitably mean greater selection and, therefore, fewer numbers for higher education at eighteen plus, particularly since - in the case of teacher education and training - the three year certificate course only required five 'O' Level passes. (Williams, 1972).

In short, as will be examined in the concluding chapter of this thesis, the greatest pressure behind the numbers and costs in the 1972 White Paper came from the continuing, and incessant demand, for more and more higher education, and the increasing difficulty for the Government of finding the resources to provide for it. (Ford, 1973:134). Any policy decision on higher education, in general, and teacher education and training, in particular, would be influenced by the economic 'situation'. The Plowden Report of 1967 had marked the high tide of economic expansion in the 1960s. The economic crisis of July 1966 had been followed a year later by the devaluation of the pound. Cuts in public expenditure programmes followed in 1968, and with them the postponement of the school leaving age. There needed to be economies, first in the higher education system, as witness the 'thirteen points' put forward by Shirley Williams in 1969, and eventually throughout the education system. Shirley Williams had put forward her thirteen points for

economies "in the most tentative manner". In 1972 the White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', did so more forthrightly and forcefully. As one commentator put it, "On the face of it, this change could be interpreted as a strengthening of the 'binary policy' - but there is no real evidence that the Government had any other motive than 'cost' in this re-adjustment of priorities". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 8 December 1972).

The basis of the policy for the education, training and supply of teachers finally outlined in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', had been established by the Robbins Report of 1963, 'developed' and 'continued' during the early part of the 1960s, and then greatly 'changed' by the binary policy of the late 1960s. Greater 'rationalization' and greater awareness of numbers and costs in higher education during the latter part of the 1960s caused the expansionist policy of the Robbins Report to be reconsidered, if not completely modified. More important, the 'process' of policy formation within the Department of Education and Science itself also changed, so that by the early 1970s the Department of Education and Science became "the power house of educational policy making" - a position which it had always had in theory, but which it now came to exercise in practice. (Kogan, 1975:124). It is this 'change' in the process of educational policy making that this thesis will examine in the next, and last, chapter.



## Chapter 7. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. According to a memorandum issued by the Department of Education and Science in April 1973, the four 'pilot schemes' for the induction of teachers would be concerned mainly with, "The allocation of probationers to schools, the selection and role of professional tutors, and the release of probationers during their first year of service for continued professional training in professional centres". (DES, 1973, Memorandum 4/73). However, the proposals for both induction and inservice education and training fell foul of the economic crises of the mid-1970s.

2. In a letter to the AEC early in 1973, the Department of Education and Science stated that the Secretary of State, in making her direct appointments to the 'Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers' (ACSTT), would have special regard to the need to strengthen the voice of the teacher training interests, including the CNAA and the Polytechnics. (DES, 1974:12).

The organisations and associations to be represented on the ACSTT were the AEC, AMC, and CCA; the ATCDE, NUT and UCET - each with two representatives; and the ILEA, WJEC, ATTI and NAS, and the Church of England Board of Education and Roman Catholic Education Council, each with one representative, together with three 'Assessors' from the Department of Education and Science. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 27 April 1973). In June 1973, it was announced that Sir Arthur Armitage, Vice Chancellor of the University of Manchester, would be the first Chairman of the ACSTT. A full list of the other members was published in July 1973. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 6 July 1973).

3. The means whereby the Department of Education and Science arrived at its figures for teacher supply came in for further criticism later in the year: "The DES has made a forecast of

the number of pupils who will be in school at the end of the decade. The Secretary of State for Education and Science has made a 'policy decision' that the pupil:teacher ratio should be reduced over-all from 22.6:1 to 18.5:1. On the basis of these two factors, the DES had made an estimate of the number of teachers needed in 1981, including provision for inservice education and training and the expansion of pre-school facilities. The number of teachers needed in service will rise from the present 365,000 to 490,000 in 1980. The fairly complex calculation of the movement of teachers out of, or back into, service has been made for the years from the present to 1980, and beyond. On the basis of all this information, the DES has calculated the total numbers of newly trained teachers needed each year, this number was not given in either the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', or in Circular 7/73. These documents merely gave the total number of student places that will be needed in 1980. This figure is to be reduced from the present 114,000 to somewhere between 60,000 and 70,000. If any Local Education Authority, regional or national Advisory Committee is to do its job effectively it must know a good deal more about the 'process' whereby the Secretary of State for Education and Science gets her figures." (Times Higher Education Supplement, 13 July 1973).

In reply, the Department of Education and Science stated that, "The issues involved were so confusing and complicated that it might be misleading to publish masses of detail at a time when the basis of the statistics was rapidly changing. The presentation of the statistics to the public would be complicated by publishing huge ranges of options based on the sophisticated techniques used to calculate teacher supply figures." (Times Higher Education Supplement, 27 July 1973).

#### REFERENCES

- Armitage, P (1973), 'The White Paper: a step into the dark'. Higher Education Review, 5. 2, pp.3-25.
- DES (1970), A Teaching Council for England and Wales: a report of the Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for

- Education and Science. (Weaver Report). HMSO.
- DES (1970), Student Numbers in Higher Education in England and Wales: a projection with some discussion of its cost implications. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, 2).
- DES (1972), Teacher Education and Training: a report of a Committee of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. (James Report). HMSO.
- DES (1972), Education: a framework for expansion. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 5174).
- DES (1973), Development of Higher Education in the Non-University Sector. HMSO. (Circular 7/73).
- DES (1974), The Induction of New Teachers. HMSO. (Memorandum 4/74).
- DES (1974), Education and Science in 1973: a report of the Department of Education and Science. HMSO.
- Drake, K (1974), 'Never Mind the Quality, Sir - Feel the Thrift'. Education for Teaching 94, pp.4-10.
- Ford, B (1973), 'Framework for Binary Consumption'. Universities Quarterly, 27. 2, pp.133-155.
- Fowler, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.
- Fowler, G T (1974), Central Government in Education. Open University. (Decision Making in British Education Systems).
- Harding, H A (1978), 'Harding Replies to Hencke over College Closures'. Education 29 December 1978 & 5 January 1979).
- Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.
- Hicks, D (1974), 'The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, 1949-65'. British Journal of Educational Studies, 22. 3, pp.249-260.
- House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), Teacher Training. HMSO. (HC 182).
- Kogan, M (1975), Educational Policy Making: a study of interest groups and Parliament. Allen & Unwin.
- Miller, H W L (1972), 'James and the Polytechnics'. Education for Teaching, 88, pp.30-35.
- Morris, N, Ryba, R and Drake, K (1973), How Many Teachers? a report prepared for the National Union of Teachers. NUT.
- Regan, D E (1977), Local Government and Education. Allen &

Unwin.

265

Weaver, T R (1979), Department of Education and Science: central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Williams, G (1972), 'Must We Choose between Nursery and University?' Times Higher Education Supplement, 29 December 1972.

Chapter 8. EDUCATIONAL POLICY FORMATION: development, continuity and change.

"The reorganisation of teacher education and training had major implications, not only for the teacher training system as a whole, but also for the rest of higher and further education. The reasons for this, even in the diffuse system of education that exists in Britain, must lie somewhere, and in this case there is no doubt that the central power-house for the 'change' was the Department of Education and Science." (Hencke, 1978:106).

This thesis has attempted to show that during the decade 1963 to 1973 the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales underwent a change, both in its 'content' and 'control', and in its 'process' of policy formation. On the content side, there was a change in the mono-technic nature of the Colleges of Education, a change brought about by the proposals in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', by which the Government made a policy decision that Colleges of Education should be encouraged to merge, or otherwise form links, with 'public sector' institutions, such as Polytechnics and Colleges of Advanced Further Education, but a change which actually started with the 'binary policy' of the mid-1960s. This change was caused not only on educational grounds, but on 'demographic' grounds as well. The birth-rate had been falling since 1965, and by 1972 - the date of the White Paper - it was already clear that fewer teachers would be needed than had been forecast in the 1960s' projections to



achieve the same pupil:teacher ratios in schools. The previous situation, with most teacher education and training taking place in Colleges of Education, separate from the rest of higher education, had lent itself well to the forced expansion of the 1960s: the changed situation, with the 'contraction' of teacher education and training as an alternative policy option, required a degree of flexibility, with the possibility of transferring teacher education and training places to other uses, and of allowing students to switch direction away from courses leading only to a teaching qualification after they had entered college.

On the 'control' side, there was a continuous thread running from the Government's rejection of the recommendation of the Robbins Report for 'Schools of Education' - which tended to link the Colleges of Education with the Polytechnics and the Colleges of Advanced Further Education in the 'public sector' of higher education under the control of the Local Education Authorities, while at the national level the administrative control of teacher supply was centralised even more firmly within the Department of Education and Science. During the decade in question, the DES slowly, but surely, became an extremely powerful and influential Department of State - a role which had been envisaged for it under the 1944 Education Act, but one which became fulfilled only with the creation of a single 'Department of Education and Science' in 1964, responsible for all sectors and levels of education, and a role which was further increased, as this thesis will examine below, by the 'rationalization' of its planning and policy making

machinery. As Salter and Tapper put it, "Policy formation in education is becoming an activity encapsulated within a limited set of structures, permeated by bureaucratic values which emphasize the importance of scientific 'rationality', efficiency and professional expertise. These are the parameters which control the rate and direction of educational 'change'. Given the Department of Education and Science's final responsibility for the administration of education, and the increasing demand for education and expenditure on it, the emergence of these more sophisticated planning mechanisms was inevitable". (Salter & Tapper, 1982:101).

The powerful and influential role of the Department of Education and Science rests primarily on the 'duties' - what must be done, and the 'powers' - what may be done, conferred upon the Secretary of State for Education and Science by the 1944 Education Act and subsequent legislation. In the case of teacher education, training and supply the Secretary of State had the duty and the power to make, "Such arrangements as he considers expedient for securing that there should be available for service in schools, colleges and other establishments maintained by Local Education Authorities, and for that purpose the Secretary of State may give to any Local Education Authority such directions as he thinks necessary, requiring them to establish, maintain or assist any Training College or other institution, or to provide or assist the provision of any other facilities specified in the direction". (Education Act, 1944:section 62).

Under the 'Teacher Training Regulations, 1967', the Secretary of State was given the power to:

- a) recognise and approve institutions in which initial education and training could be provided;
- b) determine the number of students in training in each institution;
- c) determine the nature of courses which are taught in them;
- d) specify the length of courses taught;
- e) lay down minimum entrance qualifications and the minimum age of entry.

It was also the Secretary of State for Education and Science who was empowered to secure an adequate 'supply' of teachers, which meant - in practice - that numbers in individual Colleges and Departments of Education were directly controlled by the Department of Education and Science. It is this power to control the number of teachers which demonstrates the unique position of the Secretary of State for Education and Science. Control of 'teacher supply' by the Department of Education and Science was paramount, since it was able to regulate the national supply of teachers and to decide the principles governing the recognition of teachers as qualified.(1) As Hencke puts it, "The Department of Education and Science has the power under the 'Teacher Training Regulations' to control the number of students entering teacher education courses. It can fix the number of students who enter courses in every College of Education and every Department of Education in Universities and Polytechnics. It needs this control, it says,

to prevent excesses in 'supply' and 'demand'". (Hencke, 1978:125). It might even be claimed that the very existence of the Colleges and Departments of Education depended entirely on the teacher supply policy of the Department of Education and Science - a policy which accounted for the 'expansion' of teacher education and training in the 1960s, and its 'contraction' in the 1970s. Yet, as Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science has pointed out, it was by these self-same powers that the Secretary of State for Education and Science would have been able to justify such a radical 'change' in policy for the education, training and supply of teachers - if s/he had been called upon to do so. (Weaver, 1979:40).

In short, providing for the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales was one of the principal means whereby the Government, through the Department of Education and Science, was able to achieve its objectives and priorities during the decade 1963 to 1973. These priorities and objectives, as time went on, became subject to greater 'rationalization' and 'centralization', so much so that the 'Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development' (OECD), commenting on the process of policy formation which led to the policy decisions in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', stated that, "The central Department of Education and Science is undoubtedly the most important single factor in determining the direction and tempo of educational development. The evolution of education in the United Kingdom cannot be charted without placing the 'planning

function' of the Department of Education and Science at the centre of the story". (OECD, 1975:28).

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.

The reasons for this new 'rationalization' are not hard to discover: they lay in the 'managerial revolution' which the Conservative Government introduced into the 'process' of policy formation and decision making after the General Election of June 1970. Prior to the Election the Conservative Party had pledged itself to make improvements in the machinery of government, and a White Paper, entitled 'The Reorganisation of Central Government', issued in October 1970, proposed the introduction of 'Programme Analysis and Review' (PAR), and the establishment of a 'Central Policy Review Staff' (CPRS). (HM Government, 1970, White Paper).

'Programme Analysis and Review' was, in essence, a formal method of establishing government objectives in a particular policy area, the activities which might contribute to such objectives, the resources to be devoted to these activities, and an evaluation of what was being achieved. The Department of Education and Science itself, in 1970, published a feasibility study of 'Programme Analysis and Review' in 1970, entitled, 'Output Budgeting for the Department of Education and Science'. (DES, 1970, Planning Paper, 1). The purpose of PAR was to set out, in a logical and informed way, the alternative policy options - together with their resource implications - from which Civil Servants and, ultimately, Ministers would have to choose. The PAR system was not intended to replace the existing annual 'Public Expenditure Survey' and, according to

William Pile, former Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, did not do so. (Pile, 1979:56).

The object of 'Programme Analysis and Review' was to ensure that over the course of time the main public expenditure programmes were more thoroughly examined in relation to their own objectives, and to the objectives of government policy, than was possible within the timetable of the Public Expenditure Survey, and to promote forward planning on a longer time scale. The consequences for public expenditure of policy decisions arising from the consideration of PAR by Ministers were embodied in the appropriate PES Reports and the 'Public Expenditure White Papers'. (2) The aim of the 'Central Policy Review Staff' - a small multi-disciplinary 'think tank' working in the Cabinet Office under the supervision of the Prime Minister was, "To enable Ministers to take better policy decisions by assisting them to work out the implications of their basic strategy in terms of policies in specific areas; to establish relative priorities to be given to different sectors of their programmes as a whole; to identify those areas of policy in which new choices can be exercised; and to ensure that underlying implications of alternative courses of action are fully analysed and considered". (White Paper, 1970:46).

The development of PAR and the CPRS had important consequences for the 'rationalization' of the policy making process within the Department of Education and Science. The DES had had a 'Planning Branch' since 1966, which had been established by the

then Secretary of State for Education and Science, Antony Crosland. (Kogan, 1971:176, 183 & 185). This Planning Branch had drawn together much of the statistical work of the Department of Education and Science, and had done some work on the forecasting of student numbers in higher education. (DES, 1970, Planning Paper, 2). During the first part of 1971, however, following the recommendations of the Fulton Committee on the Civil Service, a reorganisation had taken place within the Department of Education and Science and the 'Planning Branch' had been replaced by a 'Departmental Planning Organisation' (DPO). According to William Pile, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, "It had come to be recognised that there were serious limitations on the effectiveness of a 'Planning Branch' which acted alongside Policy Branches, but separately from them. Accordingly, the DES planning activities were reorganised with the object of integrating them within the existing structure for the consideration of policy and the administration of the Department's functions". (Pile, 1979:57).

The Departmental Planning Organisation became responsible for medium and long term planning within the Department of Education and Science. A 'Policy Steering Group', under the chairmanship of the Permanent (Under) Secretary, and including the most senior Civil Servants on both the operational and specialist sides of the DES, was formed, together with subordinate 'Policy Groups', concerned with higher education and schools respectively. The work of the Departmental Planning Organisation was coordinated, supported and serviced by a

'Planning Unit', headed by a Deputy (Under) Secretary, backed up by an Assistant (Under) Secretary, three Principals and supporting staff. (Fry, 1972:144, and Pile, 1974:16). The Planning Unit worked closely with economists and statisticians in the Department of Education and Science. (DES, 1972:37).

According to William Pile, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, the DPO - originally conceived in relation to the planning needs of the DES - came into existence at about the same time as the Government introduced the system of 'Programme Analysis and Review' and, therefore, "Provided a suitable instrument for discharging the Department's contribution to the working of the PAR system". (Pile, 1979:57). The first two years' work of the Departmental Planning Organisation culminated in the publication of the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'. (3) There is also strong evidence that the Central Policy Review Staff, although its work was officially confidential, was equally involved in the preparation of the 1972 White Paper and the PAR exercise which led up to it. (Pollit, 1974:385, and OECD, 1975:14). As Goldman put it, "The Central Policy Review Staff is deeply involved in all aspects of the PAR programme. They participate with the Treasury in discussions with Departments in the selection of PAR topics, in examination of the progress of PAR reports, and in the briefing of Ministers on these reports when they are completed and submitted for examination". (Goldman, 1973:49).

In addition to the rationalization of the policy making process



within the Department of Education and Science, there had also been the growing tendency during the latter part of the 1960s, as this thesis has already examined, for much of the work previously undertaken by 'external' Advisory Committees to be concentrated within the Department of Education and Science. With the demise of the 'Central Advisory Councils' and the 'National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers', the Department of Education and Science had become free, by 1970, to determine its own priorities and policies in the field of education. This, coupled with the need to rationalize 'numbers' and 'costs' in the field of higher education, in particular, brought about a change in the process of policy formation within, and without, the Department of Education and Science. One of the reasons for this 'change' was, this thesis would contend, the growing centralisation of power within the Department of Education and Science. (Lukes, 1975:150).

As the 1960s progressed, the influence of the partisans and pressure groups outside the central 'authority' - the Government and the Department of Education and Science - declined, for political and economic reasons. The Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations became more and more powerless to influence the policy making process, or to alter policy decisions. With regard to the education, training and supply of teachers, not only did the Department of Education and Science, as this thesis has examined above, have the power to regulate the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, and the 'supply' of teachers; it also

had ultimate control over two crucial areas - 'resources' and 'information'. (Select Committee, 1976:310).

#### Resources

The growing cost of financing higher education and of providing the necessary resources had led the Government in the late 1960s to question the 'numbers' and 'costs' of students entering higher education, in general, and teacher education and training, in particular. As a proportion of Gross National Product public expenditure on education had increased from 3.3% in 1952, to 4.6% in 1962, to 6.6% in 1972. Between 1962 and 1972 total public expenditure on education had risen from 1077.6 million pounds to 3114.7 million. (Westoby, 1979:8). Public expenditure on teacher education and training had more than trebled since 1961. (DES, 1969:3). The growth of such 'public expenditure programmes' was becoming unacceptable to the Government.

A major cause in the growth of public education expenditure had been 'demographic'. There were far more young people requiring education. In the 1950s the school population was not affected by the post-war increases in the birth-rate, but by the 1960s the school population had been increased by the 'bulge'. A second major cause of growth in public education expenditure was a change in government policy: the raising of the school leaving age to sixteen in 1971 required a substantial increase in the number of teachers. A third cause of the increase in public expenditure on education was the greater demand for more

education: a larger proportion of the school population was staying on at school beyond the minimum school leaving age, and was seeking places in higher education in the 1960s and early 1970s.

To begin with, economic growth made it possible for the Government to provide more education and to meet the increased demand for educational services, since it could easily claim more revenue to provide the teachers. (Rose, 1980:17). However, it is in the nature of most 'public expenditure programmes' that those who benefit are a relatively small group of the population, while those who finance the programme are the tax payers at large. This provides a concentration of political pressure in favour of specific programmes, such as education, but this concentration is not offset by any specific pressure against such programmes by the tax payers as a whole, since the impact of any one particular programme on them is too small. The main pressure against public expenditure programmes, including education, is the Government, of which the Treasury is the principal spokesman.

In times of economic buoyancy, as in the early 1960s, the main political consequence of the growing demand for more education was an increase in the number and scale of public expenditure programmes. However, when the economy started to stagnate, as in the late 1960s and early 1970s, this began to limit the creation of new public expenditure programmes, or favour an increase in programmes which did not rely upon government resources for their implementation. As the rate of long term

growth began to decline, but public expenditure did not, the Government was forced to make a policy decision about either increasing revenue by raising tax rates and reducing post-tax income, or cutting the real value of spending on public expenditure programmes, especially education. As the OECD put it, "From an economic standpoint, the growth of expenditure in this field of education has been extremely rapid and has been accompanied by a steady 'expansion' in the number of new graduates. Such developments, which were welcomed in the 1960s, have more recently been questioned. It has, for instance, been suggested that expansion went too far, too fast. The wide disparities in the distribution of educational participation and achievement have led to additional criticisms that spending on education has only benefitted a small and favoured segment of the population. Finally, since the vast majority of this expansion has been provided by the 'public sector', there has been growing concern over the taxes required to pay for rising expenditure".(OECD, 1976:7). The effects of this change in policy can be seen in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion'.

#### Information

The second area of 'control' by the Department of Education and Science was the control of , and access to 'information'. As Hencke puts it, Information is an essential commodity when a pressure group wants to understand the policy process". (Hencke, 1978:117). Yet, the evidence suggests that, during the period under consideration in this thesis, "The giving of

information to those who have a right to know, perhaps so that they can assess their own position more effectively, or influence others to act on their behalf, was severely limited". (Select Committee, 1976:XXVII).

All the evidence submitted to the House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure which, following the report by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, examined 'Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science' prior to the publication of the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', was agreed that the statistics published by the DES were comprehensive and accurate, but often long delayed, sometimes by as much as three years. However, documents dealing with policy for the education, training and supply of teachers were deliberately withheld by the Department of Education and Science, even from the Select Committee itself. For example, the Select Committee asked to see a PAR report on which the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development had commented, but was informed by the DES that, although the OECD had seen it, the report could not be revealed to the Select Committee. (Select Committee, 1976:XXX).

The Select Committee also asked to see planning papers, which had been circulated to Local Education Authorities and Universities before a policy decision was taken by the Department of Education and Science to aim, by 1981, to divide students in further and higher education equally between Polytechnics and Universities. The Select Committee's request was again refused by the Government. (Select Committee,

1976:XXX). As a result, the Select Committee felt moved to comment, "We believe that the habit of 'secretiveness' - the instinct to hold rather than voluntarily to share information - lies at the root of most of the criticisms of the DES consultative process". (Select Committee, 1976:XXXI). A similar view had already been expressed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: "It cannot be doubted that groups outside the Department of Education and Science believe that departmental decision making is not conducted sufficiently in the open and, moreover, that secrecy at central level may impair the coordination between central and local administration. Policy is less likely to be whole-heartedly accepted when the process which leads up to its formation is guarded as arcane secrets". (OECD, 1975:31).

Besides criticising the excessive secrecy of the Department of Education and Science, the Select Committee also attempted to remedy the situation by recommending the setting up of a 'Standing Education Commission' - with the authority and resources to contribute to planning and policy formation for the whole education system: "The Standing Education Commission should have access to any DES facts and figures which the Secretary of State for Education and Science has not specifically ordered to remain confidential". (Select Committee, 1976:XXXIII). Following its previous policy the Government again rejected this recommendation. (DES, 1976:16).

According to some, the secrecy of the Department of Education and Science in not revealing the basis of its policy proposals

in the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', was part of a deliberate 'conspiracy of silence' within the DES, designed to conceal its reluctance to publish 'information', in order to preserve its Civil Servants from informed attacks on their policy decisions, and upon the statistical foundation upon which these decisions were based. As one commentator put it, "The most serious danger is that the absence of supporting information makes it difficult to understand the significance of the various recommendations. All tracks have been so carefully covered that it is impossible to believe that it was not done deliberately". (Times Higher Education Supplement, 29 December 1972). A similar view was expressed by the NUT: "As with the James Report, a major difficulty in evaluating the impact of the education reforms proposed in the 1972 White Paper is the absence of vital statistical information. The refusal to publish the necessary statistical information leads the Union to conclude that, either the Secretary of State and the Department of Education and Science are confused and ill-informed over what information is required, or that it has been decided that fully informed public debate would not facilitate the policy changes the Government has in mind". (NUT, 1972:3).

According to others, the secrecy of the DES policy formation process was the inevitable result of the development of a powerful 'technocracy' within the Department of Education and Science. As Pratt puts it, "Armed with trendy new economic, budgetary, costing and projecting tools, a new breed of policy makers within the DES seems gradually to be capturing the areas

of initiative once the preserve of Ministers, Local Education Authorities, Teachers' Associations and others in education". (Pratt, 1973:72). There is certainly strong evidence, as this thesis has already revealed, that the increasing use of 'Programme Analysis and Review' (PAR) and the 'Central Policy Review Staff' (CPRS), together with the decreasing use of 'external' Advisory Committees, such as the 'Central Advisory Council on Education' and the 'National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers', had caused the policy making process in education to become very much 'internalised'. According to William Pile, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, policy formation at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s had become such an art that only the most gifted practitioners could do it - with the result that the scope for ministerial and public discussion had been substantially reduced. (Pratt, 1973:69).



## CONCLUSION.

This thesis has attempted to analyse the policies for the education, training and supply of teachers in England and Wales put forward between 1963 and 1973 by the Government and the Department of Education and Science, Advisory Committees and Committees of Inquiry. In so doing, it has shown not only how, and why, the 'content' of teacher education and training underwent a change in nature from 'mono-technic' to 'poly-technic' - but also how, and why there occurred a change in the 'control' of teacher education and training as it became firmly established in the 'public sector' of higher education.

More importantly, this thesis has also shown that there was a change in the 'process' of policy formation itself. As examined, one of the key distinctions employed in this thesis has been that between models of policy formation as being either 'rational' or 'incremental'. This thesis has shown that the rational dimension in policy formation became stronger and more significant between 1963 and 1973, not only in content and control, but more particularly in process - a rationalization brought about by the increased use by the Government and the Department of Education and Science of such techniques as policy review, cost-benefit analysis and output budgeting, and by the increased tendency by the Department of Education and Science to use 'internal' Planning Units, rather than 'external' Advisory Committees or Committees of Inquiry. This thesis has further shown that the increase in 'rationality' in policy formation and decision making was accompanied by a

parallel centralisation of 'power' in the Department of Education and Science, not only as a result of its duties and powers to influence the 'content' and 'control' of teacher education and training, and to regulate the 'supply' of teachers, but also as a result of its control over the two key areas of 'information' and 'resources'.

It has to be admitted, however, from the evidence examined, that - while the rationalization of the process of policy formation was an important factor in the centralisation of power within the Department of Education and Science - it did not always lead, necessarily, to increased rationality in content. Indeed, the evidence has suggested that one important effect was to make the increased rationality of policy formation and decision making in the Department of Education and Science - which was itself largely an invisible abstraction - one that had political force, but one which could not readily be used to justify publicly policy content in its proposals or outcomes. For example, the so called 'conspiracy of silence' about the lack of statistics in both the James Report and the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', commented on by both the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure, was one direct outcome which failed to be understood or appreciated by the education world at large. As Hugh Harding, former Assistant (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, expressed it, "The 'situation' in the 1960s suited all parties. The education world was happy with the 'quantity', if not the 'quality', of

the growing output of newly trained teachers, and regarded it as politically unthinkable that funds would not be found for their employment. Politicians were not yet willing to tackle the sensitive political 'issue' involved". (Harding, 1978).

There is also strong evidence that the 'content' of teacher education and training changed 'incrementally' during the decade under consideration in this thesis, with a consensus achieved by all the authorities, partisans and pressure groups - via the recommendations of the Robbins Report, Plowden Report and James Report - for the introduction of the BEd degree and the creation of an all-graduate teaching profession. However, in the case of teacher 'supply' the evidence suggested that there was a marked increase in 'rationality' - with a better and more efficient use of scarce economic resources being the main aim and criterion for the policy decisions made.

As examined in this thesis, the first 'response' by the Government and the Department of Education and Science to the lack of control of public expenditure programmes had been the 'Public Expenditure Survey Committee (PESC) - a system which had been established following the Plowden Report in 1961. The central argument of the Plowden Report had been that, "Decisions involving substantial future expenditure should always be taken in the light of public expenditure as a whole, over a period of years, and in relation to the prospective resources". (Plowden Report, 1961). The PESC has been described as, "The first of the 'rationalist' alternatives - an alternative policy making system to the pluralist,

incrementalist model". (Richardson & Jordan, 1979:34).

However, with the PESC there was no attempt to define overall goals or objectives, no attempt to present options in the submission of a government Department, such as the Department of Education and Science, to the Cabinet, and no attempt to weigh one option against another in a quantitative fashion. As this thesis has examined, the main 'response' by the Government and the Department of Education Science to the 'incremental' model of policy formation was 'Programme Analysis and Review' (PAR) and the 'Central Policy Review Staff' (CPRS) - by which Ministers and Civil Servants were forced to appraise a particular programme against objective criteria. As Clarke puts it, "PAR and PESC are designed to become the basis of a new system of formulating and carrying out the policy of Government. This should not be regarded as an addition to the conventional system: for, if it survives, it must ultimately replace the traditional system". (Clarke, 1971).

Finally, as this thesis has examined, the asymmetrical pressures to expand, yet at the same time to contain, public expenditure was related to the growing necessity - as the decade 1963 to 1973 progressed - to subject the component parts of public expenditure on education - particularly those parts directly open to influence or control by the Department of Education and Science, such as teacher education, training and supply - to resource constraints. As a result, the influence of the various pressure groups and partisans in education, such as the Local Education Authorities and the Teachers' Associations, decreased

as education became dominated by government economic policy and the search for economic efficiency, and by the question of resources, numbers and costs in education, particularly in higher education and the education, training and supply of teachers. To quote William Pile, Permanent (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science: "These changes reflect the growing recognition that an essential function of the DES, over and above the performance of specific practical and administrative duties deriving from the Education Acts, is that of 'resource planning' for the education service as a whole, i.e. the formulation of objectives, the framing of national policy best calculated to meet these objectives, the undertaking of long term costings of policy in a way that enables Ministers to choose their priorities, and the task of effectively presenting the consequential resource needs with central Government". (Pile, 1979:59).

This thesis began by defining an 'issue' as a 'situation' in which by common consent some intervention, or action, was needed. Such issues call for a 'response' from Government. In the first half of the 1960s the situation required an 'expansion' in the supply of teachers to provide for the rapidly growing number of pupils in primary and secondary schools in England and Wales. This situation altered dramatically when a demographic change occurred and the effects of the falling school population came to be felt. The situation facing the Government and the Department of Education and Science in the late 1960s and early 1970s was how to provide for the increasing number of students who wished to

enter higher education, including teacher education and training, at a cost which the country could afford. The Government 'responded' to this issue, not by 'ad hoc' piecemeal measures, but by a sophisticated process of planning and policy formation, which saw teacher education, training and supply as part of a wider whole. (OECD, 1975:11-14 and Select Committee, 1976:1-4). The whole issue was given an added impetus by falling roles and the worsening economic situation.(4)

The Government and the Department of Education and Science was compelled to make a wider and deeper review of its policy for the education, training and supply of teachers than it had ever before attempted. This policy became part of the larger issue of educational planning and priority fixing. As a result, the 1972 White Paper, 'Education: a framework for expansion', was concerned in the main with the reallocation of scarce resources in the light of changing or redefined objectives and programmes. In the words of Morris and Fowler, "The 1972 White Paper is best considered as an exercise in resource switching, rather than as one of 'expansion'. Had the James Committee not reported a year ago, some such exercise would still have been necessary". (Morris and Fowler, 1973).

## Chapter 8. NOTES &amp; REFERENCES.

## NOTES

1. It was fear of loosing its control over teacher supply which led the Department of Education and Science in 1966, at a time of severe teacher shortage, to flatly refuse to consider the establishment of an 'General Teaching Council' which might - by raising entry standards and limiting intake - effectively reduce the numbers of teachers going into schools. Such a contraction of teacher supply would have been unwelcome to the Government.

Even in 1970, when the teacher supply position was improving, similar fears were still evident, since the Weaver Report proposed that there should be two separate Committees - one dealing with 'training' with twenty teacher representatives out of a membership of 40, and the other dealing with 'supply' with only five teacher representatives out of 29. (Weaver Report, 1970:5 & 24).

2. The 'Public Expenditure Survey' (PES) was essentially a technique for collecting together the implications of government 'public expenditure programmes', existing and proposed, and evaluating and adjusting them in the light of the requirements of national economic management and changing government priorities. 'Programme Analysis and Review' (PAR) starts at the opposite end of the spectrum with the individual programme. PAR is thus complementary to PES, not in conflict with it.

The PES system provides for an annual 'review' of all public expenditure programmes, made at constant prices, over the coming five years. The annual review starts with projections of spending on the basis of existing policies and, after Cabinet decisions, ends with the publication of the annual 'Public Expenditure White Paper', containing the stated public expenditure plans for the next five years.

Just as there is a 'Public Expenditure Survey Committee' (PESC), so there is a 'Programme Analysis and Review Committee' (PARC). Both Committees are chaired by the same Treasury Civil Servant, but government Departments are represented on the PARC by their 'Planning Officers' - rather than their 'Finance Officers' who serve on the PESC. It should be noted, however, that the PARC is merely a coordinating committee, guiding the choice of topics for PAR studies in the individual Departments, and monitoring the application of the PAR technique throughout Government. (Jay, 1972).

3. According to Toby Weaver, Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, preparation for the 1972 White Paper represented the biggest united effort ever undertaken by the DES during his lifetime: "Some two to three score members of the Department devoted a substantial part of their time over two years to its preparation. First, we had to listen to, systematize and assess a large volume of ideas, aspirations, complaints and suggestions, which were brought to us from all the different parts of the educational world. The Department then had to produce a practical policy - which came within the Department's resources - to satisfy everyone'. (Times Higher Education Supplement, 2 March 1973).

To meet the demands made by the 1972 White Paper, a major reorganisation of the Department of Education and Science took place in April 1973, when the three Branches concerned with further and higher education were reorganised into four, i.e. the three existing Branches dealing with Further Education, Teacher Training and the Universities became 'Higher and Further Education Branches I-IV', all under the control of one Deputy (Under) Secretary. The remaining three Deputy (Under) Secretaries at the DES remained responsible for Schools, Science and Arts and Libraries. (DES, 1973, Administrative Memorandum 8/73).

4. According to Toby Weaver, former Deputy (Under) Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, the change in policy for higher education was brought about by the economic



siutaion: "It was not long before the economic storm clouds gathered. By December 1973 the Government had decided on substantial cuts in planned public expenditure programmes, and the education programme was seriously curtailed. When the Labour Government took office in March 1974 it confirmed its support for the 'framework for expansion' - but it felt compelled to give a further turn to the screw of retrenchment." In particular, according to Toby Weaver, the decline in the birthrate, the stabilized teaching profession and the decrease in wastage among teachers, together with the worsening economic situation all contributed to the change in Government policy for the education, training and supply of teachers. (Weaver, 1979:71).

#### REFERENCES

- Clarke, R (1971), New Trends in Government. HMSO. (Civil Service College Studies, 1).
- DES (1969), Educational Expenditure. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 53).
- DES (1970), A Teaching Council for England and Wales: a report of the Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science. (Weaver Report). HMSO.
- DES (1970), Output Budgeting for the Department of Education and Science: a report of a feasibility study. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, 1).
- DES (1970), Student Numbers in Higher Education in England and Wales: a projection with some discussion of its cost implications. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, 2).
- DES (1972), Education and Science in 1971: a report of the Department of Education and Science. HMSO.
- DES (1973), Organisation of the Department. HMSO. (Administrative Memorandum 8/73).
- DES (1976), The Government's Reply to the Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee - 'Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science'. HMSO. (Cmd. 6678).
- Education Act (1944), An Act to Reform the Law Relating to Education in England and Wales. HMSO.
- Fry, G K (1972), 'Policy Planning Units in British Central

Government Departments.' Public Administration, 50, 2, pp.139-155.

Goldman, S (1973), The Developing System of Public Expenditure Management and Control. HMSO. (Civil Service College Studies, 2).

Harding, H A (1978), 'Harding Replies to Hencke over College Closures'. Education, 29 December 1978).

Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.

HM Government (1970), The Reorganisation of Central Government. HMSO. (Cmd.4506).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1976), Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science. (Tenth Report). HMSO. (HC 621).

Jay, P (1972), 'PESC, PAR and Politics'. Times, 31 January 1972.

Kogan, M (1971), The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan. Penguin.

Lukes, J R (1975), 'Power and Policy at the Department of Education and Science: a case study'. Universities Quarterly, 29. 2, pp.133-165.

Morris, V and Fowler, G T (1973), 'The White Paper: resource switching, not genuine expansion'. Times Higher Education Supplement, 12 January 1973.

NUT (1972), Executive Statement on the Reform of Teacher Education.

OECD (1975), Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales. OECD. (Reviews of National Policies for Education).

OECD (1976), Public Expenditure on Education. OECD. (Studies in Resource Allocation, 2).

Pile, W (1974), 'Corporate Planning for Education in the Department of Education and Science'. Public Administration, 52. 1, pp.13-22.

Pile, W (1979), The Department of Education and Science. Allen & Unwin.

Pollitt, C C (1974), 'The Central Policy Review Staff, 1970-74'. Public Administration, 52. 4, pp.375-392.

Pratt, J (1973), 'An Open Plan Department of Education and Science?' Higher Education Review, 5. 2, pp.68-73.

Richardson, J J and Jordan, A G (1979), Governing Under Pressure: the policy process in a post-parliamentary democracy. Robertson.

Rose, R (1980), Changes in Public Employment: a multi-dimensional comparative analysis. Centre for the Study of Public Policy. (Studies in Public Policy, 61).

Salter, B and Tapper, T (1982), Education, Politics and the State: the theory and practice of educational change. MacIntyre.

Weaver, T R (1979), Department of Education and Science: central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Westoby, A (1979), Finance for Education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 7).

## STATISTICS OF TEACHER SUPPLY - Table 1.

Student Teachers admitted to courses of initial training.

## COLLEGES OF EDUCATION.

	Robbins Forecast	NACTST Forecast	Actual
1963	21,000	21,000	21,486 (26,261)
1964	24,300	24,300	25,076 (30,444)
1965	24,600	24,600	29,616 (38,876)
1966	25,000	26,000	34,033 (39,509)
1967	26,400	27,500	36,187 (42,657)
1968	27,500	30,000	39,574 (46,648)
1969	28,500	33,000	38,943 (45,971)
1970	30,000	37,000	38,772 (46,519)
1971	32,500	40,000	41,344 (49,592)
1972	35,000	40,000	42,133 (50,632)

Figures in brackets includes Colleges, Polytechnics and Universities.

Source: Robbins Report, NACTST Reports and DES, Statistics of Education, Vol. 4.

## STATISTICS OF TEACHER SUPPLY - Table 2.

## Student Teachers on Courses of Initial Training.

	Colleges*	Polytechnics	Universities
1963	53,436	-	3,443
1964	61,434	-	3,739
1965	72,167	-	3,695
1966	84,373	-	3,912
1967	95,168	563	4,270
1968	103,154	1,155	4,724
1969	105,986	1,292	4,743
1970	107,386	2,387	5,094
1971	109,724	2,571	5,158
1972	110,973	2,548	5,326

\*Includes Colleges of Education (Technical).

Source: DES, Statistics of Education (England and Wales), Vol. 4.

## STATISTICS OF TEACHER SUPPLY - Table 3.

## Number of Teachers in Schools (Public Sector).

1963	277,292
1964	280,461
1965	283,950
1966	291,118
1967	296,549
1968	302,662
1969	314,486
1970	328,174
1971	346,850
1972	365,305

Source: DES, Statistics of Education (England and Wales), Vol. 4.

## STATISTICS OF TEACHER SUPPLY - TABLE 4.

Student Teachers admitted to BEd degree courses.

	Universities awarding BEd	Students on BEd courses	Students awarded BEd degrees
1968	5	234	219
1969	21	1490	1388
1970	21	2437	2260
1971	22	3048	2878
1972	23	3674	3508
1973	23	4249	4054

Source: ATCDE 'BEd Degree Survey' 1973.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## PRIMARY SOURCES (Official Publications).

## Parliamentary Papers

Education Act (1944), An Act to Reform the Law Relating to Education in England and Wales. HMSO.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1963), Higher Education. Hansard, 681:544.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1963), Science and Education. Hansard, 684:809.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1964), Education and Civil Science: ministerial responsibility. Hansard, 688:1339.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1964), Teacher Training Colleges: report. Hansard, 703:1971.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1965), Higher Education. Hansard, 707:390-398.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1965), Higher Education. Hansard, 709:751-841.

House of Commons Parliamentary Debates (1966), Higher Education. Hansard, 714:86.

House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1960), University and Other Higher Education. Hansard, 223:615-732.

House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1963), Higher Education. Hansard, 253:1208.

House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (1965), Higher Education. Hansard, 270:1250-1275 & 270:1279-1370.

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1968), Her Majesty's Inspectorate. HMSO. (HC 400).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1969), Student Relationships. HMSO. (HC 449).

House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Science (1970), Teacher Training. HMSO. (HC 182).

House of Commons Select Committee on Procedure (1969), Scrutiny of Public Expenditure and Administration. HMSO. (HC 410).



House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1971), Government Financial Control and Budgeting in Education. HMSO. (HC 545).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1972), Further and Higher Education. HMSO. (HC 48-1).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1976), Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science. (Tenth Report). HMSO. (HC 621).

House of Commons Select Committee on Expenditure (1977), The Civil Service. (Eleventh Report). HMSO. (HC 535).

#### Government (Command) Papers

Board of Education (1944), Teachers and Youth Leaders. (McNair Report). HMSO.

Central Advisory Council on Education (1959), 15 to 18: an inquiry into the education of boys and girls between 15 and 18 in relation to the needs of society and the individual. (Crowther Report). HMSO.

Central Advisory Council on Education (1963), Half Our Future. (Newsom Report). HMSO.

Central Advisory Council on Education (1967), Children and Their Primary Schools. (Plowden Report). HMSO.

Committee on Higher Education (1963), Higher Education: a report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-63. (Robbins Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2154).

Committee of Inquiry into the Organisation of Civil Science (1963), The Organsiation of Civil Science. (Trend Report). HMSO. (Cmd. 2171).

Department of Education and Science (1964-73), Education and Science: a report of the Department of Education and Science. HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (1965), The Role of Higher Education in Regional and Technical Colleges Engaged in Advanced Work. HMSO. (Administrative Memorandum 7/65).

Department of Education and Science (1966), Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: higher education in the further education system. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 3006).

Department of Education and Science (1966), Government of the Colleges of Education: Report of the Study Group under the Chairmanship of T R Weaver. (Weaver Report). HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (1967), Training of Teachers Regulations. HMSO. (Statutory Instrument 792).

Department of Education and Science (1968), The Distribution of Teachers. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 42).

Department of Education and Science (1969), Educational Expenditure. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 53).

Department of Education and Science (1970), The Polytechnics. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 65).

Department of Education and Science (1970), A Teaching Council for England and Wales: Report of the Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science. (Weaver Report). HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (1970), Output Budgeting for the Department of Education and Science: report of a feasibility study. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, 1).

Department of Education and Science (1970), Student Numbers in Higher Education in England and Wales: a projection with some discussion of its cost implications. HMSO. (Education Planning Paper, 2).

Department of Education and Science (1971), Probationary Teachers. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 68).

Department of Education and Science (1972), Teacher Education and Training: a Report of a Committee of Inquiry under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. (James Report). HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (1972), Education: a Framework for Expansion. (White Paper). HMSO. (Cmd. 5174).

Department of Education and Science (1973), The Supply of Teachers. HMSO. (Reports on Education, 78).

Department of Education and Science (1973), The Development of Higher Education in the Non-University Sector. HMSO. (Circular 7/73).

Department of Education and Science (1973), The Organisation of the Department. HMSO. (Administrative Memorandum 8/73).

Department of Education and Science (1974), The Development of Higher Education in the Non-University Sector: interim arrangements for the control of advanced courses. HMSO. (Circular 6/74).

Department of Education and Science (1974), The Induction of New Teachers. HMSO. (Administrative Memorandum 4/74).

Department of Education and Science (1975), The Reorganisation of Higher Education in the Non-University Sector: further education regulations. HMSO. (Circular 5/75).

Department of Education and Science (1976), The Government's Reply to the Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee - Policy Making in the Department of Education and Science. HMSO. (Cmnd. 6678).

Department of Education and Science (1980), The Provision of Information by Government Departments to Select Committees. HMSO. (Cmnd. 7982).

HM Government (1961), The Civil Service. (Plowden Report). HMSO. (Cmnd.1432).

HM Government (1963), Higher Education: government statement on the report of the Committee under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins. HMSO. (Cmnd.2165).

HM Government (1965), National Plan. HMSO. (Cmnd.2764).

HM Government (1970), The Reorgansiation of Central Government. HMSO. (Cmnd.5178).

Ministry of Education (1956), Technical Education. HMSO. (Cmnd.9703).

Ministry of Education (1961), Better Opportunities in Technical Education. HMSO.

National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce (1965), Committee on Technical College Resources: the size of classes and approval of further education courses. (Pilkington Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1951), Training and Supply of Teachers. (First Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1951), Reconstruction and Training of Youth Leaders and Community Centre Wardens. (Second Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1953), Graduate Teachers of Mathematics and Science. (Third Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1954), Training and Supply of Teachers for Handicapped Pupils. (Fourth Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1956), Three Year Training for Teachers. (Fifth Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1957), Scope and Content of the Three Year Course of Teacher Training. (Sixth Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1958), The Supply of Teachers in the 1960s: correspondence between the Chairman of NACTST and the Minister of Education. HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1962), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1960-80. (Seventh Report). HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1962), The Future Pattern of Education and Training of Teachers. (Eighth Report): HMSO.

National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (1965), The Demand and Supply of Teachers, 1963-86. (Ninth Report). HMSO.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1969), Innovation in Higher Education: New Universities in the United Kingdom. OECD.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1975), Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales. OECD. (Reviews of National Policies for Education).

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1976), Public Expenditure on Education. OECD. (Studies in Resource Allocation, 2).

University Grants Committee (1968), University Development, 1962-67. HMSO. (Cmd.3820).

University Grants Committee (1974), University Development, 1967-72. HMSO. (Cmd.5728).

#### Non-Government Papers

Association of Assistant Mistresses (1972), Teacher Education and Training. AAM.

Association of Education Committees (1971), Memorandum of Evidence to the Teacher Training Inquiry. AEC.

Association of Education Committees (1972), Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee: teacher education and training. AEC.

Association of Head Mistresses (1971), Evidence Submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the Education and Initial Training of Teachers. AHM.

Association of Head Mistresses (1972), Teacher Education and Training. AHM.

Assistant Masters Association (1972), Teacher Education and Training: the Association's comments on the James Report. AMA.

Association of Municipal Corporations (1971), Training of Teachers: memorandum by the Association. AMC.

Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (1971), The Professional Education of Teachers: a memorandum submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the education and training of teachers. ATCDE.

Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (1972), A Statement by the Executive Committee on Teacher Education and Training. ATCDE.

Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions (1971), Evidence to the James Committee on Teacher Education. ATTI.

Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions (1972), Comments by the Executive Committee on the James Report. ATTI.

Association of University Teachers (1971), Submission to the Government's Inquiry into the Education and Initial Training of Teachers. AUT.

Association of University Teachers (1972), Submission to the Secretary of State for Education and Science on the James

Report. AUT.

Committee of Directors of Polytechnics (1972), Statement of Views upon the Report on Teacher Education and Training. CDP.  
Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals of University Institutions (1972), Preliminary Statement on the Report - 'Teacher Education and Training'. CVCP.

Conservative Party (1970), Better Education. (Party Manifesto).

Head Masters Association-Head Masters Conference (1972), Report of a Working Party on Teacher Training. HMA-HMC.

Head Masters Association-Head Masters Conference (1972), Our Schools and the Preparation of Teachers. HMA-HMC.

Inner London Education Authority (1971), The Training of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee of Inquiry into teacher training. ILEA. (Appendix to the Report of the Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee to the Education Committee, 12 May 1971).

Inner London Education Authority (1972), Teacher Education and Training: observations on the James Committee Report. ILEA. (Joint Report of the Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee and Schools Sub-Committee).

Joint Four Associations (1971), Evidence to the James Committee on Teacher Training. Joint Four.

Labour Party (1963), Higher and Further Education: report of a Labour Party Study Group. (Taylor Report). Labour Party.

Labour Party (1963), Report of the 62nd. Annual Conference of the Labour Party. Labour Party.

Labour Party (1970), Education and Social Equality. (Party Manifesto). Labour Party.

National Association of Head Teachers (1972), Teacher Education and Training: an appraisal of the recommendations of the James Report. NAHT.

National association of Schoolmasters (1971), The Training and

Education of Teachers for Primary and Secondary Schools. NAS.  
National Association of Schoolmasters (1972), A Comment on the  
James Report on Teacher Education and Training. NAS.

National Union of Students (1971), The Education and Training  
of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee. NUS.

National Union of Students (1972), Teacher Education after  
James. NUS.

National Union of Teachers (1971), The Reform of Teacher  
Education: a policy statement on the future of teacher  
education. NUT.

National Union of Teachers (October 1971), James: cause for  
concern. NUT.

National Union of Teachers (November 1971), James: the report  
of a meeting called by the NUT to discuss the James Committee  
and its possible recommendations. NUT.

National Union of Teachers (February 1972), James: a critical  
appraisal. NUT. (An Executive Statement on the James Report on  
Teacher Education).

National Union of Teachers (December 1972), Executive Statement  
on the Reform of Teacher Education. NUT.

Standing Conference of Heads of Departments of Education in  
Polytechnics (1971), Evidence to the James Committee. SCHDEP.

Society of Education Officers (1972), Comments on the James  
Report. SEO.

Universities Council on the Education of Teachers (1971), The  
Education of Teachers - Looking to the Future: evidence to the  
Committee of Inquiry into teacher education. UCET.

Universities Council on the Education of Teachers (1972),  
Interim Statement on the James Report. UCET.

Universities Council on the Education of Teachers (1972), UCET  
on James. UCET.

Universities Council on the Education of Teachers (1972),  
Alternatives to James. UCET.

University of London Institute of Education (1971), An Inquiry  
into the Education and Training of Teachers in the Area of the  
Institute, 1970-71. ULIE. (ATO Review).

University of London Institute of Education (1971), The Context

of Reform in the Education and Training of Teachers: evidence to the James Committee. ULIE.

University of London Institute of Education (1972), The Education and Training of Teachers: a statement by the Council of the Institute on the James Report. ULIE.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SECONDARY SOURCES (Books &amp; Articles)

- Ahamad, W (1970), 'A Post Mortem on Teacher Supply Forecasts'. Higher Education Review, 2. 3, pp. 21-40.
- Ahamad, W and Blaug, M (1973), The Practice of Manpower Forecasting. Elsevier.
- Anderson, J E (1975), Public Policy Making. Nelson. (Basic Concepts in Political Science).
- Annan, N (1967), 'The Reform of Higher Education'. Political Quarterly, 38. pp. 234-252.
- Armitage, P (1973), 'Planning in Practice: the work and legacy of the external committee', in: Fowler, G (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.
- Armitage, P (1973), 'The White Paper: as step into the dark'. Higher Education Review, 5. 2, pp.3-25.
- Bates, A W (1972), 'Reformation or Revolution? The relevance of the James Report to the state of education'. London Education Review, 1. 2, pp. 3-10.
- Blum, A A (1969), Teachers' Unions and Associations. University of Illinois Press.
- Boyle, E (1966), 'Parliament and University Policy'. Minerva, 5. 1, pp. 3-19.
- Boyle, E (1972), 'Ministers and Educational Reports'. Universities Quarterly, 27. 1, pp.3-10.
- Boyle, E (1979), Government, Parliament and the Robbins Report. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture).
- Bridges, E (1950), Portrait of a Profession. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R (1970), The Administrative Process in Britain. Methuen.
- Brown, R and Howell, D A (1983), Educational Policy Making: an analysis. Heinemann. (Studies in Education, 12).
- Browne, J D (1979), Teachers of Teachers: a history of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Burgess, T (1971), Dear Lord James: a critique of teacher

education. Penguin.

Burgess, T (1978), 'Change and Content'. Higher Education Review, 11. 1, pp. 26-39.

Burke, V (1971), Teachers in Turmoil. Penguin.

Chapman, R A (1973), The Role of Commissions in Policy Making. Allen & Unwin.

Clarke, R (1971), New Trends in Government. HMSO. (Civil Service College Studies, 1).

Coates, R D (1972), The Teachers' Unions and Interest Group Politics. Cambridge University Press.

Cobb, R W and Elder, C D (1972), Participation in American Politics: the dynamics of agenda building. Allyn & Bacon.

Corbett, A (1973), Much To Do About Education. Campaign for Educational Advance.

Crossman, R H S (1963), 'Robbins, Hailsham and Newsom'. New Society, 1 November 1963.

Downs, A (1957), An Economic Theory of Democracy. Harper.

Downs, A (1967), Inside Bureaucracy. Little Brown.

Drake, K (1973), 'The Scope for Economic Analysis', in: Lomax, D E (1973), The Education of Teachers in Britain. Wiley.

Drake, K (1974), 'Never Mind the Quality, Sir, - Feel the Thrift' Education for Teaching, 94. pp.4-10.

Dye, T R (1972), Understanding Public Policy. Prentice Hall.

Easton, D (1965), A Framework for Political Analysis. University of Chicago.

Eggleston, J (1972), 'Teacher Education After the James Report'. Secondary Education, 3.1, pp

Farquahar, R H and Housego, I E (1978), Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration. University of British Columbia.

Fenwick, K and McBride, P (1981), The Government of Education. Robertson.

Finer, S E (1966), Anonymous Empire: a study of the lobby in Great Britain. Pall Mall.

Ford, B (1960), 'New and Larger Universities'. (Gulbenkian

Educational Discussion). Universities Quarterly, 15. 2, pp.124-138.

Ford, B (1964), 'Second Thoughts on Robbins'. Universities Quarterly, 18. 1, pp.119-168.

Ford, B (1971), 'Trinary Forebodings'. Universities Quarterly, 26. 1, pp.3-5.

Ford, B (1972), 'Report on James'. Universities Quarterly, 26. 2, pp.127-163.

Ford, B (1973), 'Framework for Binary Consumption'. Universities Quarterly, 27.2, pp.133-155.

Fowler, G T (1972), 'The Binary Policy in England and Wales', in: World Year Book of Education, 1972-73. Evans.

Folwer, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

Folwer, G T (1974), Central Government in Education. Open University. (Decision Making in British Education Systems, 1).

Fowler, G T (1979), 'The Accountability of Ministers', in: Lello, J (1979), Accountability in Education. Ward Lock.

Fry, G K (1972), 'Policy Planning Units in British Central Government Departments'. Public Administration, 50. 2, pp.139-155.

Gamson, W A (1968), Power and Discontent. Dorsey.

Gladden, E N (1963), Central Government Administration: a student's guide to public administration.

Gladden, E N (1967), Civil Services in the United Kingdom, 1853-1970.

Goldman, S (1973), The Developing System of Further Education Management and Control. HMSO. (Civil Service College Study, 2).

Gosden, P H J H (1966), The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales. Blackwell.

Hall, P (1975), Change, Choice and Conflict in Social Policy. Heinemann.

Hanson, A H and Wallis, M (1970), Governing Britain. Collins/Fontana.

Harding, H A (1978), 'Harding Replies to Hencke over College Closures'. Education, 29 December 1978.

Harman, G (1978), 'Policy Making and Policy Processes in

Education', in: Farquahar, R H and Housego, I E (1978), Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration. University of British Columbia.

Heclo, H H (1972), 'Policy Analysis'. British Journal of Political Science, 2. pp

Hencke, D (1977), 'Government and College Reorganisation'. Higher Education Review, 9. 3, pp. 7-18.

Hencke, D (1978), Colleges in Crisis: the reorganisation of teacher training, 1971-77. Penguin.

Hewitt, S (1971), The Training of Teachers: a factual survey. University of London Press.

Hicks, D (1974), 'The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, 1949-65'. British Journal of Educational Studies, 22. 3, pp. 249-260.

Jay, P (1972), 'PESC, PAR and Politics'. Times, 31 January 1972.

Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kimber, R and Richardson, J J (1974), Pressure Groups in Britain. Dent.

Kogan, M (1971), The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Antony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan. Penguin.

Kogan, M (1973), 'The Function of the Central Advisory Council in Educational Change', in: Fowler, G T (1973), Decision Making in British Education. Heinemann.

Kogan, M (1973), 'The Plowden Committee on Primary Education', in: Chapman, R A (1973), The Role of Commissions in Policy Making. Allen & Unwin.

Kogan, M (1975), Educational Policy Making: a study of interest groups and Parliament. Allen & Unwin.

Kogan, M and Packwood, T (1974), Advisory Councils and Committees in Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Layard, R, King, J and Moser, C (1968), *The Impact of Robbins*. Penguin. (Penguin Education Special).
- Lello, J (1979), *Accountability in Education*. Ward Lock.
- Lindblom, C E (1959), 'The Science of Muddling Through'. *Public Administration Review*, 19. pp.50-59.
- Lindblom, C E (1965), *The Intelligence of Democracy: decision making through mutual adjustment*. Collier MacMillan.
- Lindblom, C E (1968), *The Policy Making Process*. Prentice Hall.
- Locke, M (1974), *Power and Politics in the School System*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Logan, D (1972), 'Reactions to the James Report'. *Secondary Education*, 2. 3, pp
- Lomax, D E (1973), *The Education of Teachers in Britain*. Wiley.
- Lomax, D E (1976), *European Perspectives in Teacher Education*. Wiley.
- Lukes, J R (1967), 'The Binary Policy: a critical study'. *Universities Quarterly*, 22. 1, pp.6-46.
- Lukes, J R (1975), 'Power and Policy at the Department of Education and Science: a case study'. *Universities Quarterly*, 29. 2, pp.133-165.
- McConnell, T R and Fry, M A (1972), 'Flexibility or Rigidity: university attitudes to the James Report'. *Higher Education Review*, 4. 3, pp. 13-29.
- Manzer, R A (1970), *Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944*. Manchester University Press.
- Matterson, A (1981), *Polytechnics and Colleges: control and administartion in the public sector of higher education*. Longman.
- Miller, H W L (1972), 'James and the Polytechnics'. *Education for Teaching*, 88, pp.30-35.
- Morris, N (1969), 'England', in: Blum, A A (1969), *Teachers' Unions and Associations*. University of Illinois.

Morris, V and Fowler, G T (1973), 'The White Paper: resource switching, not genuine expansion'. Times Higher Education Supplement, 12 January 1973.

Morris, N, Ryba, R and Drake, K (1973), How Many Teachers? A report prepared for the National Union of Teachers. National Union of Teachers.

Niblett, W R (1975), The University Connection. National Foundation for Educational Research.

Ollerenshaw, K (1974), Returning to Teach. University of Lancaster Department of Educational Research.

Parry, J P (1972), The Lord James Tricycle: some notes on teacher education and training. Allen & Unwin.

Payne, N P (1975), The Colleges of Education. Aspects of Education.

Pile, W (1974), 'Corporate Planning for Education in the Department of Education and Science'. Public Administration, 52. 1, pp. 13-25.

Pile, W (1979), The Department of Education and Science. Allen & Unwin.

Political and Economic Planning (1960), Advisory Committees in British Government. Allen & Unwin.

Pollitt, C C (1974), 'The Central Policy Review Staff, 1970-74'. Public Administration, 52. 4, pp. 375-392.

Pollitt, C C (1979), Public Policy in Theory and Practice. Hodder & Stoughton.

Pratt, J (1973), 'An Open Plan Department of Education and Science?'. Higher Education Review, 5. 2, pp. 68-73.

Regan, D E (1977), Local Government and Education. Allen & Unwin.

Rhodes, R A W (1979), Public Administration and Policy Analysis: recent developments in Britain and America. Gower.

Richardson, J J and Jordan, A G (1979), *Governing Under Pressure: the policy process in a post-parliamentary democracy*. Robertson.

Robbins, L (1971), *Autobiography of an Economist*. MacMillan.

Robinson, E E (1968), *The New Polytechnics*. Cornmarket.

Rose, R (1969), *Policy Making in Britain: a reader in government*. MacMillan.

Rose, R (1980), *Changes in Public Employment: a multi-dimensional comparative analysis*. Centre for the Study of Public Policy. (Studies in Public Policy, 61).

Rose, R (1981), *The Growth of Government in the United Kingdom since 1945: a programme of research*. Centre for the Study of Public Policy. (Studies in Public Policy, 94).

Salter, B and Tapper, T (1982), *Education, Politics and the State: the theory and practice of educational change*. MacIntyre.

Simon, H A (1965), *Administrative Behaviour: a study of decision making pressures*. MacMillan.

Solesbury, W (1975), 'The Environmental Agenda: an illustration of how situations become political issues, and may demand responses from Government, or how they may not'. *Public Administration*, 53. 3, pp.381-410.

Smith, B (1976), *Policy Making in British Government*. Robertson.

Taylor, W (1973), *Research Perspectives in Education*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Taylor, G and Saunders, J B (1976), *The New Law of Education*. Butterworths.

Taylor, W (1978), *Research and Reform in Teacher Education*. National Foundation for Educational Research.

Tibble, J W (1971), *The Future of Teacher Education*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Vaizey J and Sheehan, J (1968), Resources for Education. Allen & Unwin.

Vig, N J (1968), Science and Technology in British Politics. Pergamon.

Warren, C F (1971), Teacher Training: a consideration of the parliamentary Select Committee on Education and Science, 1969-70, and its work, with an examination of those factors in the education of teachers abstracted from the material which it produced. University of Lancaster Department of Educational Research. (Unpublished MA Dissertation).

Warren, C F (1973), 'The Evidence for James'. Education for Teaching, 90, pp. 37-45.

Weaver, T R (1973), Higher Education and the Polytechnics. College of Preceptors. (Joseph Payne Memorial Lecture, 1973-74).

Weaver, T R (1979), Department of Education and Science: central control of education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 2).

Westoby, A (1979), Finance for Education. Open University. (The Control of Education in Britain, 7).

Wheare, K C (1955), Government by Committee: an essay on the British Constitution. Oxford University Press.

Wiley, F T and Maddison, R E (1971), An Inquiry into Teacher Training. University of London Press.

Williams, G (1972), 'The Costs of the James Report'. Times Higher Education Supplement, 24 March 1972.

Williams, G (1972), 'Must We Choose between Nursery and University?' Times Higher Education Supplement, 29 December 1972.

Williams, G (1973), 'The End of the Robbins Era', in: Jones, K (1973), The Year Book of Social Policy in Britain. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wilson, H (1971), The Labour Government, 1964-70: a personal record. Cape.

World Year Book of Education, 1972-73. (1973). Evans.